Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

MER

100

Xmas/92

for Mrs
for Mfg.

HISTORY

OF THE

AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH

FROM THE PLANTING OF THE COLONIES TO THE END OF THE CIVIL WAR

BY

S. D. McCONNELL, D.D.

RECTOR OF ST. STEPHEN'S CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA

FOURTH EDITION.

NEW YORK

THOMAS WHITTAKER

2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

Copyright, 1890,
By Thomas Whittaker.

283.73
M129
4th ed

TO THE

Congregation of St. Stephen's Church,

PHILADELPHIA,

WHO WERE SADLY NEGLECTED WHILE IT WAS BEING WRITTEN,

This Book

IS AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED.

47485

"Superficial it must be, but I do not disown the charge. Better a superficial book which brings well and strikingly together the known and acknowledged facts, than a dull, boring narrative, pausing at every moment to see farther into a millstone than the nature of the millstone will admit."

—Sir Walter Scott, Journal, Dec. 22, 1825.

CONTENTS.

PART FIRST.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN THE COLONIES.

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE STAGE 5

The Indians; ownership of the soil; occasion of the immigration; the Spanish Peace; the Act of Uniformity; its effect to destroy the national quality of the Church.

II. THE VIRGINIANS 14

Raleigh's Colony; Gorges' Colony; the Virginia Company; the first Church; English interest in Colonial ventures; Indian Missions; Pocahontas; first representative Assembly; laws concerning Religion; spirit of the laws; relaxation of manners.

III. THE PURITANS 26

Religious parties in England; not unequal division; the Churchmen's theory; the "Pilgrims"; the Salem Colony; Puritan theory and practice; the Puritan temper; the Puritan laws; planting the Church; John Morton; the Brown brothers; the Rev. William Blaxton; Churchmen in Massachusetts; withdrawal of the Charter; the Church and the Government; parish organized in Boston; Governor Andros; the Old South; King's Chapel; the quarrel ended.

IV. THE ROMAN CATHOLICS 48

Lord Baltimore; the Maryland Colony; Romanists and religious liberty; persecution by them impossible; slow growth of the colony; "bad Catholics"; revocation of the Charter; unworthy Clergy; the situation in 1770.

V. THE DUTCH 59

Seeking the East Indies; ecclesiastical position of the Dutch; the Dutch as settlers; religious toleration; coming of the English; Church establishment; plan for the Episcopate; Trinity Church.

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. THE SOUTH RIVER 69

The Swedes; their absorption by the English; George Fox; Quakerism; extravagance and repression; persecution; Quakers in New Jersey; William Penn; Penn's Colony; Quakers coming to the Church; George Keith; first Pennsylvania Church; increase and spread.

VII. THE CAROLINAS 82

Indians and Welsh; the "noble" Colony; religious condition; Church establishment.

VIII. A GENERAL SURVEY 86

The year 1700; Services; use of the Prayer Book; social status of the Clergy; Clerical manners; effect of Puritanism upon the Ministerial office; conflict with the Vestries; effect of government support; the Church in New England; in the Middle Colonies.

IX. THE "VENERABLE SOCIETY" 96

Dr. Bray; his report upon the Church in the Colonies; the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; instructions to Missionaries; Keith and Talbot; conciliating Dissenters; building churches; work of the Missionaries.

X. THE COMMISSARIES: MARYLAND 105

Dr. Bray; the Maryland establishment; attempt to reform manners; the Clergy *vs.* the people; hostile legislation; growth of other churches.

XI. THE COMMISSARIES: VIRGINIA 112

William and Mary College; opposition to the College; the College and the Church; decline of discipline; attempt at reform; devoted men in the Church; growing spirit of Americanism; the "Parsons' Cause"; Patrick Henry; the results.

XII. THE NEW ENGLAND CONVERTS 127

President Cutler; the question of Orders; the attraction of the Church; President and Professors of Yale enter the Church; Puritan opposition; accessions; Dean Berkeley.

XIII. THE "GREAT AWAKENING" 136

Jonathan Edwards; the "Revival" at Northampton; Edwards's theory of "conversion"; "bodily exercises"; spread of the movement; the "jerks"; meets Whitefield; attitude of Churchmen; the reaction; effect upon American religion; the Church's position; how affected by the movement.

CHAPTER PAGE

XIV. THE GERMANS 147

First German immigration; the "Pennsylvania Dutch"; religious character and condition; the Moravians; their influence on Whitefield; intractable material for the Church.

XV. THE SCOTCH-IRISH 153

England and Scotland at the Reformation; Calvinism and Presbyterianism; Presbytery and Episcopacy; Episcopal rigor; emigration to Ireland; emigration to the United States; hostility to the Church; a cordon around her; influence upon the Church.

XVI. THE METHODISTS 160

The first American sect; its origin; Methodists the first "Ritualists"; the Wesleys in Georgia; Wesley as a parish priest; Wesley and the Moravians; Wesley's "conversion"; desperate state of Religion in England; the Methodist purpose; Whitefield the preacher and Wesley the organizer; Methodism comes to America; still within the Church; the Methodist "Bishops"; the loss by separation.

XVII. THE EPISCOPATE 173

Two theories of the Church; disadvantage of the Church's theory in the Colonies; Ordination and Discipline; early efforts for the Episcopate; the need of it patent; great opportunities lost; the "S. P. G.'s" plan; the Pennsylvania plan; reasons of the failure; current conception of the Episcopal office; Colonial opposition; early thought of separation; legal status of the Colonies; opposition not unreasonable; John Adams's opinion; not possible till after the Revolution; idea of an "Independent Episcopal Church"; Dr. White's plan; the popular judgment.

XVIII. A SURVEY 190

Spread of the Church in Connecticut; in New York; in New Jersey and Pennsylvania; in the South; Indian Missions; sources of gain; lack of Clergy; state of Religion; influence of Franklin; coarseness of the age; social distinctions; Services; Architecture; Confirmation; Clerical support.

XIX. THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE 202

The inevitable conflict; equal division of parties; exodus of Tories; lay Churchmen's position; position of the Clergy; "patriot" Clergy; "loyalist" Clergy; sufferings of the Clergy; desolation of the Church.

PART SECOND.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER PAGE

I. GATHERING UP THE FRAGMENTS 215

The confusion; treatment of the Tories; popular opinion about the Church; three motives in reorganization; the Southern attempt; the Church named; organization in Maryland and Virginia; relation of Church and State settled.

II. THE NEW ENGLAND PLAN 223

New England Churchmanship; distrust of loose views; first Connecticut Convention; political obstacles; choosing a Bishop; the programme; the sentiment in England; English Bishops' reluctance; the Scotch and New England Churches; the Nonjurors; the first Bishop.

III. THE FEDERAL IDEA 238

Colonial school of statesmanship; Rev. Dr. White; the Conference at New Brunswick; fundamental principles; Constitutional Convention; two proposed policies; State and Church Constitutions; laymen in Church Councils; revising the Prayer Book; the "Proposed Book"; Fourth of July Service; anti-dogmatic spirit; Unitarianism; the Episcopate; Address to the English Bishops; the Bishops' reply; Bishops chosen.

IV. THE TWO EPISCOPACIES 254

Two Episcopal Churches; obstacles to union; plans to perpetuate the separation; striving for union; Dr. Parker's scheme; Convention of 1789; Bishop White and the English succession; adjusting difficulties; Bishop Seabury's Toryism; adopting a Liturgy; modifying the Constitution; consolidation.

V. STRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT 264

The experiment revolutionary; government by Convention; relation of the three orders; powers of a Bishop; right of Visitation; encroachment of Standing Committee; powers of the House of Bishops increased; discipline of the Laity; control of the Liturgy; Uniformity; Hymns; power of General Convention; State autonomy; its gradual abandonment; The Thirty-nine Articles; their origin; their obligation.

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW 277

Old men and new times; a dark epoch; French infidelity; position of the Church; Confirmation; slack administration; troubles in New York; election of Hobart; the question of wigs; condition in the South; low estate in Virginia; Meade ordained; situation in New England; Bishop Seabury's manner; Dr. Coke's proposition; Methodists gone beyond recall; dawning of better days; new men at work; representative men; beginning of Sunday-schools; state of the Church in 1820.

VII. WAITING FOR VOLUNTEERS 297

The national Church passive; pioneer Churchmen; religion in the backwoods; first thought of Missions; two streams of emigration; Bishop Chase; in New Orleans; pioneer missionary in Ohio; the frontier Bishop; Kenyon College; the Church in Kentucky; Bishop Otey; the Church in Tennessee; new departure in 1835.

VIII. NEW SPIRITUAL FORCES 311

Meagre spiritual life; the Evangelicals; their differentiate; conscious experiences; Simeon's Confessions; their conception of the Church; Low Churchmen; their achievements; cause of their decline; Thomas Scott; their leaders in America; High Church revival; the two parties; division of labor; advance of Churchmanship; following the emigration; two Ideals.

IX. THE CATHOLIC RENAISSANCE 324

Emergence of Church Idea; trial of Bishops; agencies at work; increasing activity; change of manners; corporate religion; the "Oxford Movement"; the "Tractarians"; the *Via Media;* Newman's purpose; the *Via Media* in America; American Churchmen; Anglo-Catholics; a time of strife; perverts and converts; good and evil of the Movement.

X. A PLACE WHERE TWO WAYS MEET . . . 342

Falling behind the population; a Church or a Sect; the Memorial; emancipation of the Episcopate; loosening of Rubrics; revival of the Diaconate; Church Unity; divers opinions; a true bill found; a fatal choice; spirit of General Convention; progress in a narrow path; the Church in California; the Church in Oregon; muttering of coming war.

CHAPTER PAGE

XI. IN WAR TIME 360

Division of Churches upon the question of Slavery; political division furthered thereby; Episcopal Church not divided; general sentiment in the Church; the Church faulted; mutual understanding; Southern Bishops oppose secession; Southern idea of the Church and the States; Secession; the Church and the Union; the Church in the Confederacy; conflict with Federal authorities; General Butler as a Canonist; fall of the Confederate Church.

XII. THE REUNITED CHURCH 374

Moving toward union; obstacles in the way; Arkansas: Bishop Wilmer; Bishop Polk; General Convention of 1865; reunion imperilled; Mr. Horace Binney's resolution; Dr. Kerfoot's plea; reunion; disbandment of the Confederate Church; religious effects of the war; new forces and new problems; task of the present generation.

INTRODUCTION.

For many years I had it in my mind to attempt a History of American Christianity. It has been frequently noticed that the Christianity of America possesses characteristics of its own. It is not only different in many regards from that which subsisted in Europe at the time of the settlement of the colonies; but it is different from that which subsists in any other portion of Christendom now. Christianity here wears a garment of American weaving and American adornment. The religious history of the country is quite as striking as its political; it has had as many and as marked epochs; the influences which have shaped it have to be sought for in more numerous and more diverse sources; and those influences are more actively at work now than are those which produce political changes.

With this fact in view I thought to trace the stream of religious life in the United States to its many and various sources, to estimate the relative size and importance of the affluents which have colored it, and maybe to forecast its future course.

I found the project to be so difficult that I abandoned it. Contemporary history is the least valuable of all

kinds. The relative importance of events and persons cannot be fairly estimated till time has tested them and shown which is great and which is small. The coherence of the facts in the religious history of our land cannot yet be seen. The facts themselves are abundant to embarrassment; but they cannot yet be strung upon any single thread which I have been able to discover. In the political history of the country the unifying fact is the gradual coalescence of a number of independent and rival political organizations into one great whole, bound together by their common interest in a constitutionally regulated liberty.

But alas! the ecclesiastical history of the United States has lagged a whole century behind its political. Free and independent churches are coincident in date with free and independent colonies. In the State the movement toward unity set in a hundred years ago; in the Church it is only beginning to show itself. The Church has been content for most of this time with Mexican anarchy. It had been excused or justified by precisely the same arguments which were used in the colonies against the adoption of the federal Constitution: "Liberty is best secured by allowing each to work in its own way; the danger of attack from without is so remote and unlikely that it need not be considered; the original charters of each are inalienable; the weak ones will be swallowed up by the strong; mutual jealousies and ancient grudges are too strong and deep-rooted to be overcome; no principle of federa-

tion can be proposed which can ever be adopted; the different colonies can best dwell together as brethren by not coming into too close relations."

While this condition of things remains there cannot be written a history of the American Church. That will not be possible until there shall be an American Church. That time will surely come, — when, no man may say.

I have undertaken therefore the more modest task to set out the history of the *Protestant Episcopal Church* in the United States. Its life is continuous from the beginning. It was first on the ground. It is of interest to all Churchmen, and, for reasons which I hope to make evident, ought to be to all Americans. I shall speak of it habitually as "*the Church*" — not as arrogating for it an exclusive right to that title, but because its legal name is uncouth and clumsy. I shall try to tell the story of what it has accomplished, and to speak candidly of its excellences and its faults. A history should above all things else be true. Glozing of faults and apologizing for wrong deeds is not the part of an honest friend or of an honest man. The Church can afford to have the truth told even about herself. He who finds it in his way to do this may not be accused of uncovering his mother's nakedness.

But in the telling of the story large space will be occupied in examining the religious character and habits of those among and upon whom the Church has wrought. She has done great things for them, whereof

they are not ashamed to say they are glad, but they have also done much for her. The Episcopal Church has been far more profoundly modified by her environment here than her members realize. Some of her most cherished possessions have come to her from without. In many cases she has never known, or has long since forgotten, the name of the giver, but still holds and values the gift. It will be our task to notice the reciprocal influence of this Church upon the communities where she has lived, and of those peoples upon her. We will see that she has thriven among Puritans and Quakers, Baptists and Presbyterians, Dutch, Germans, and Irish; has taught them all something, and learned something from them all.

PART I.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE COLONIES.

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

PART I.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE COLONIES.

CHAPTER I.

THE STAGE.

We will take for the starting-point the year 1600. We will notice in their order the Stage, the Actors, and the Drama.

The stage upon which the action begins is the Atlantic seaboard, from the Kennebec on the north to the Savannah on the south, and extending backward roughly to the Mississippi. To the north and northwest the French are in possession. Seventy years before this time Cartier had sailed up the St. Lawrence, and anchored his shallop off the Heights of Abraham. Champlain and his little band of hardy adventurers are "seeking the skins of beasts and the souls of men" on the banks of the great lakes. That picturesque movement of French exploration and Jesuit missionary zeal had already set in which carried Marquette to the Illinois, Hennepin to the Falls of St. Anthony, and La Salle to the Brazos. Unfortunate Acadie was in its infancy.

Le Caron, the Franciscan monk, and the Jesuits Jogues, Brebœuf, and Garnier were getting ready for that career which was to end in martyrdom among the Hurons and Iroquois.

On the south and southwest the Spaniards held the soil. Forts and churches were on the St. John's and the Gulf, and a bishop with his priests on the Rio Grande.

But from Maine to Georgia no white man dwelt. It was a virgin field upon which to work out the problems in religion, politics, and social life, which were perplexing England. The country was not without inhabitants. It was held by the only race of savages who have ever been able to make a stand against the advancing army of civilization. These withstood it, fought it off, broke themselves against it, dammed it back in one locality, only to find it flowing in behind them in another, until they perished in their tracks, or became encysted within set limits among the new people. How many Indians there were three centuries ago, it is not possible now to know. The consensus of scientific guesswork sets the number at about one million, within the present territory of the United States. They were divided roughly into three great groups or clusters.

The Indians.

(1) The Algonkins, who have left their crabbed polysyllables in the names of New England lakes and rivers. (2) A subdivision of the same great family, of a more euphonious speech and a fiercer savagery, whose seat was between the Hudson and the Susquehanna, and stretching westward indefinitely to and beyond the Mississippi. (3) The Appalachians, dwell-

ing south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi. In their manners they ranged from absolute savagery in the north to semi-barbarism in the south.[1] The conversion of these people to Christianity was the first, or, at any rate, the first-named motive for the coming of all the colonies. We shall have to notice again and again the efforts made to carry out this purpose. We will find it to be a record of failures. We will discover also a strange uniformity of feature in the successive failures. In every case the intelligence, apparent self-restraint, dignity, and gravity of the Indian led the missionaries to forecast great successes. The first essay always seemed to justify great hopes. The Indian listened, argued, seemed to be concerned, gave his children to be taught, and led the missionary to report the probable conversion of his whole tribe. But always, just when the project seemed most hopeful, an indiscriminate massacre of missionaries and converts together swept the enterprise out of existence. The experience of all was the same.[2] Jesuit, Churchman, Puritan, Moravian, and Presbyterian missions all had the same issue. Their light was put out in blood on the Mohawk, the James, the Connecticut, and the Wabash. The "great massacre" is the last chapter in the history of the Indian mission in early days. They were irreclaimable as panthers. With intellectual endowment far beyond that of any other savage race, they were marked by the two qualities of treachery and cruelty to an indescribable degree. To love his enemy and to speak the truth seems to have been to the Indian con-

[1] Parkman: Discovery of the Great West, p. 275.
[2] Ibid., p. 26.

genitally impossible. In any case, this was true until they became reduced to helplessness two centuries and a half later, by being surrounded and disarmed. This fierce and hateful people roamed over the land in which a Christian church and nation was to grow. They had no ownership in it, in the way we understand the term. The tribes lived far apart. Each had for its own hunting-grounds the territory from which it was not barred by its rivals. Each looked with jealousy upon all interlopers, but each was prompt to act as an interloper when occasion offered. Every good hunting-ground was claimed by many tribes. It was rare indeed that any tribe had an uncontested title to a tract of land, and where such a title did exist it rested, not on an actual occupancy and cultivation, but on the recent butchery of weaker rivals.[1] It is within the truth to say that the only title of any value either in law or morals which Indians have ever possessed is that given them by the people whom they fought for centuries, to the Reservations where the remnant of them now live.

Ownership of the soil.

From whence will come settlers hardy enough to occupy this richly furnished, but savage and perilous stage? To answer this we must cross the ocean and see the colonists in their old homes.

Within ten years of 1600 two events occurred in England which set in motion the emigration to America. They were: (1) The treaty of peace with Spain.[2] (2) The revived enforcement of the Acts of "Uniformity" and "Supremacy." The way they operated was as follows: —

Occasion of the emigration.

[1] Roosevelt: Winning of the West, vol. i. p. 88.

[2] The Peace was concluded Aug. 18, 1604.

For three generations England had been at war by sea and by land. The need of the belligerent times had created a class of men whose trade was warfare. "Sea dogs," like Frobisher, Drake, Hawkins, and Hudson with their hardy crews, holding letters of marque from the Protestant Princes of Europe, or commissions from the Crown, had learned sailing and fighting as a craft. Soldiers of fortune like Raleigh, Smith, and Standish had carried their swords to market in every Protestant State in Europe. Each captain with his ship and crew, each swash-buckler with his band of musketeers at his heels, made his own bargain, or hired out his ship and guns to serve in any quarrel which his somewhat tough conscience would allow him to espouse. They were soldiers by profession and training, one might almost say by birth. They had swept around the British Isles chasing the Armada, and had fought against the Spaniard in the Low Countries, and against the Turk on the plains of Hungary. Now, the unwonted experience of a peace with their hereditary foe left them without employment. With their crews and their companies they were thrown upon the world to earn a livelihood. There was no place for them in England. The England of 1600 was not the mighty empire of industry and commerce that it is to-day. London was a town smaller in size and with less than half the wealth of Denver or Hartford. Bristol and Plymouth, the places next in importance, were such as Norwich, Conn., or Norfolk, Va., are to-day. There was but little commerce; manufactures were of the rudest, and agriculture the most primitive. Wolves

were still dangerous within a day's ride on horseback of London. Swamps and fens held the places where cities now stand. Wild cattle were still found in the north. The farmer lived in a wattled and clay-covered house. The country was too small and too poor to absorb and provide for the multitude of soldiers and sailors out of occupation through the unwonted peace. The sea-dog therefore became an explorer, and the soldier of fortune was ready to guard the peaceful colonist.

The revival of the "Act of Uniformity" at the same juncture made England an uncomfortable place for nearly one-half of her population. The Act provided that every congregation of Christian people, in its public worship, must use the Book of Common Prayer according to its rubrics. The Prayer-Book was distasteful to a large proportion of the people, for various reasons. A few opposed it on principle as being Romish. To their minds the Reformation in England had stopped midway to completion. They thought they saw in the authorities, civil and ecclesiastic, a disposition to bring in again the evils of papal times. They had for their ideal the church in Geneva and Frankfort as fashioned by Calvin and Farel. The Prayer-Book imposed upon them by law — a law enforced by fire, stocks, jail, and banishment — seemed to them to be in its very words and structure a league with death and a covenant with hell. Their objection was not only an abstract one against the attempt to enforce uniformity in worship, but also against the Prayer-Book which was imposed. They believed its doctrine to be dangerous to souls. This class was not

Act of Uniformity.

large, but was active, learned, and filled with a sullen determination. But there was a far larger class who were led by prejudice and by customary usage to the same stand. The Act seemed to them to be, as indeed it was, a taking away of the hereditary right of Englishmen.[1] Uniformity of worship had never been known in England. A variety of uses, as York, Sarum, Bangor, and Hereford, had prevailed unquestioned up to within less than half a century of this time. In the early part of Elizabeth's reign there had been little change in the manner of public worship, of the sort which would strike the eye of the common worshipper. But for nearly a generation great confusion had existed. In some parishes the service was not distinguishable from the Roman mass, and in others from a Presbyterian meeting. In one parish the Holy Table was set up against the east wall altarwise, and in another set out "like an oyster board" in the aisle. In one parish a celibate priest officiated in cope and chasuble, while in the next a married priest held forth in his coat, while his wife wore the embroidered vestments for a petticoat. This state of things became intolerable to the authorities of the Church. They essayed to cure it by violence, and failed. But they did more than fail. By the attempt they destroyed the Church of England as a National Church. For a thousand years before that time the Church and the Nation had been one. From that time forward the Church of England ceased to be the Church of the English-speaking people. The confusion

Effect to break up the National Church.

[1] Anderson: History of the English Church in the Colonies, vol. i. p. 99.

which was attempted to be cured by the Act of Uniformity was a grave evil. No man could then see to what greater evils it might grow. The attempt to secure order by force commended itself to wise and good men. It is not necessary to accuse the Church's officers of conscious tyranny. They used what seemed to them the simplest and most efficacious method at hand. Time has shown their fearful blunder. They meant to act as statesmen; they acted as *doctrinaires*. The confusion of the time was but the restless exuberance of the incoming spiritual life to a half-dead Church. In time its excesses would have righted themselves. The attempt to secure uniformity in worship has only been successful, even within the Church, at those times when its life has been at the lowest. Every outburst of religious vigor has either strained the uniformity or broken a fragment from the Church. The Puritan, the Presbyterian, the Quaker, and the Methodist have each in their turn been lost to the Church which is their home, by making the house too strait for them. After two hundred and eighty years the assembled Bishops of the whole Pan-Anglican Communion have recorded their judgment that uniformity in discipline and worship is not only not to be compelled, but not to be expected. They declare with a unanimous voice, that with consensus upon the Creed, the Scriptures, the Sacraments administered in our Lord's own words, and the historical Episcopate, the people are to be left to the guidance of the Spirit which Christ has promised to His Church. The lesson has taken long to learn, and the teaching has been most costly. It cost the Church

of England first the good-will, and then the presence, of those who carried away from her enough of devotion and vigor to found a new Nation and alien Churches.

Here, then, in 1600, were all the elements waiting from which to create a new world. A fertile continent waiting to be settled; a righteous and virile people, ill at ease at home, for colonists; adventurous captains with their ships and crews ready to transport them; professional soldiers ready at hand to garrison the new colonies, and fight against their savage foes. The flood of immigration approached America like the coming in of the tide. Its first waves touched only the nearest shore, and receded. Many unrecorded bands of adventurers visited, and quickly left the coast, from Newfoundland to Georgia. The story of each is romantic, but not to the purpose here.[1]

[1] Bancroft: History of the U. S., vol. i. *passim*.

CHAPTER II.

THE VIRGINIANS.

THE first organized attempt to found a colony was made in 1585. Sir Walter Raleigh gathered a company of one hundred and fifty people, largely composed of gentlemen of the sword, secured them an outfit and the means of transportation, which they used to find a land at Roanoke which they named "Virginia," for the maiden queen. They were not the stuff from which successful colonists are made. They were not set together in families. Only two women were in the colony. Of one of these, the daughter of the Governor, was born Virginia Dare, the first white child in America. Improvidence, brawling, ignorance of husbandry, and wanton quarrels with the natives, soon brought the ill-starred colony to want, destitution, and despair. Their governor, White, strove manfully to save them from the Indians and from themselves, but in vain. They sat down starving upon the shore, and when at their wits' end, hailed the sight of an English man-of-war on her way home from the West Indies. Her commander consented to bear away with him those who wished to go, and promised to send speedy succor to those who stayed. The chaplain of the ship landed and baptized the little baby girl, Virginia Dare, together with Manteo, the first convert from

Raleigh's colony.

the Indians. These were the first-fruits, not only of the Church of England, but of Christianity, in the colonies. Eighty of the company chose to stay, while the rest sailed away to merry England. Those who stayed, including the two women, were never heard of again. Their promised relief never came, or came so many years later that no living member of the colony was found. Half a century afterward Indians with blue eyes and brown hair were seen along the Potomac, who were supposed to have in their veins all that was left of the blood of the Raleigh colony.

In 1603 a ship's company spent the summer in Plymouth Harbor, on the coast of Massachusetts, but made no permanent lodgement.

In the spring of 1605 a company landed at the mouth of the Kennebec. While the summer lasted they throve in the cabins and little garden patches which they planted, but in the long, bleak winter which followed they were reduced to starvation and despair, and returned hungry to England, carrying with them three Indian chieftains. These were taken in charge by a wealthy gentleman and zealous Churchman, Sir Ferdinando Gorges. For three years he kept them in his house, teaching them English, and learning from them about their people. Then he organized an expedition at his own charge, and brought it out himself, landing again at the Kennebec in the summer of 1606. By the time winter came his company had built a fort, a log church, and fifty cabins. This settlement of Churchmen maintained a precarious existence for many years; indeed, it never became quite extin-

Gorges' colony.

guished. But it had for its enemies a cruel climate and a barren soil, and a few years later the relentless enmity of the Massachusetts Puritans. The Church has had there a longer continuous existence than in any other place in America, but it did little more than live. It never became a colony, and hardly an organized church. It served for a century only to keep the lamp of the Church showing a flickering light in the New England.

All the "ventures," so far, were without recognition from either Church or State. They were the enterprises of individuals or companies without either political status or ecclesiastical authority.

It was to Virginia first that the Church and State of England were to be transplanted. Raleigh's ill-fated company had never been quite forgotten. Relief expeditions had been projected, and had come to nothing, until it was deemed too late to rescue them. But the memory of the flowery banks and fertile meadows of Albemarle had never quite passed away. London merchants thought of it as a new field for trade. Bishops and clergy thought of the Indians as heathen to be saved. Statesmen had it in mind as a place wherein to found new states. All England then dreamed of colonies. A company was formed, with archbishops, peers, merchants, and high officers of state for its members. Captain John Smith, who had come home from fighting the Turk under the walls of Constantinople, was secured as the military commander. The good priest Robert Hunt was commissioned chaplain. The Crown gave a grant of land from 34° to 45°

The Virginia Company.

north latitude, — from the Bay of Fundy to South Carolina. Substantial Churchmen, with their wives and children and goods, offered for colonists. Prayers were said in churches for the safety of the expedition. With the bishop's benediction, the king's favor, and the people's good-will, they sailed away. Their plan was to take up again Raleigh's abandoned settlement, and they were not without hope of being welcomed by some of his people, who might still be living. But the fleet lost its reckoning, and, instead of making a landfall at Albemarle, they sailed into Chesapeake Bay in April, 1607. They named their settlement for the king, Jamestown. By their charter the Law and the Church of England were made bounden. Their first act, on landing, was to kneel and hear Chaplain Hunt read the prayers and thanksgiving for a safe voyage. It is not our task to trace the civil and industrial prosperity of the colony. Their church was built as soon as their cabins were, and as they moved into better houses God's house was adorned to correspond. Their first sanctuary was, the chaplain writes, "a pen of poles with a sail for a roof, and for a pulpit a bar lashed between two convenient trees." In this rude temple the Holy Communion was celebrated for the first time in America, according to the Liturgy of the Church, June 21, 1607.

The first church.

Virginia was marked off from the settlements soon to follow by two things, — it was a royal colony, and a Church one. It was simply a little English parish, bringing its minister, its Prayer-Book, its customs, and its thoughts, to set them down in the midst of an unoccupied land. It set about to reproduce the old home

life, but it had to gain by bitter experience the knowledge of how to win a livelihood, — the knowledge which soon became a second nature to the settlers. They had to learn how to deal with the crafty natives, to coax a rich land to yield its substance, to learn new modes of husbandry, to adjust themselves to a new life. The task was a trying one. Cold, drought, malaria, and hunger brought them to the verge of despair, but through it all good Chaplain Hunt was their stay and comfort. If they were in perils oft, they were in prayer oft. At times they despaired. Once they determined to abandon the enterprise, but, while they were gathering to embark, the long-looked-for relief ship hove in sight, bearing supplies and new people. The shed in which the prayers had wont to be said was replaced by a more comfortable building, of which the chaplain speaks with grateful pleasantry as "a homely thing like a barn, set on cratchets, covered with rafters, sods, and brush."

English interest in ventures.

A wide-spread and deep interest was created in the settlement among all classes at home. To "have a venture" to the colonies quickly came to be the fashion. New-comers came out by the score. The population grew apace. Collections were taken by the Archbishop's orders in the province of Canterbury for the Church in Virginia. One sent Bibles and Prayer-Books, and another, Communion plate. Chaplain Hunt did not long remain the only priest. Others came as they were needed. These first clergy were godly and well-learned men, — differing widely from the clerical adventurers who succeeded

them a generation later. Good Church people at home promoted schemes for the advantage of their cousins in the Virginias. One society undertook to provide for them wives who should be worthy helpmeets for such men, and sent them over at a hundred pounds of tobacco a head. An official acknowledges in clerkly phrase the arrival of "two shiploads of women in fair condition."

Their religious duty to the aborigines was not neglected. The good priest Alexander Whittaker gained for himself the title of "Apostle to the Indians." Indian children were secured and placed in the homes of the settlers, to be trained in decency and Christianity. Pocahontas, the comely daughter of the unfriendly chief Powhattan, was secured. The newly widowed John Rolf was moved alike by her beauty and her heathenism, and to make her a convert took her to wife. Other missionaries joined Whittaker in his work among the Virginians and in the forest. They reported to the authorities at home that there was every promise of bringing these heathen soon to a knowledge of the Gospel, and asked for still more men. The Indians were friendly, hospitable, and full of interest. But before the missionaries' report reached England the treacherous savages burst into the settlement, with the great massacre of May 22, 1622. Missionaries, converts, and frontier settlers were all alike butchered, and the work came to an end. It had run swiftly through all the phases which characterized the projects to Christianize the Indians for two centuries and more.

Indian missions.

Pocahontas.

It is of interest to note that Virginia was the only

place where a colony of Church people lived their life in the presence of hostile savages. The Puritans on the banks of the Connecticut, the Moravians in the valley of the Wyoming, the Presbyterians on the Alleghany, and the Baptists on the Holston and the Tennessee bore their rifles with them to Church and gathered their corn while listening for the dreaded war-whoop. But, save in the early days of Virginia, this was never the experience of Church of England people. There are no Boones and Crocketts, Robertsons and Clarkes in the annals of the American Church. People of another faith soon passed beyond them and formed a barrier behind which the Churchman was safe from this peril. But as the Churchman was shut off from the danger, so he was shut out from the kindly fellow-feeling which bound together the other peoples who through generations shared a common peril. This lack of sympathy deepened into rooted malevolence when a hundred and fifty years later the British government, to whom the Church was bound, took for allies the unspeakable savages whom the Baptists and Presbyterians had been fighting with for four generations.

Virginia soon recovered from the massacre of 1622. The colonist had learned his foe. Their valiant Captain Smith scouted along the frontiers and carried the war into the enemy's country. When he was about to start upon an expedition into the backwoods he received from the authorities orders that "every day the Prayers should be read, with a psalm," at which order being carried out he gravely records that "the salvages were mightily amazed."

Meanwhile the colony had grown apace. Two thousand immigrants arrived in a single year. Land-hunters pushed up the James, the Chickahominy, and the York. New settlements were planted and new parishes organized. The Church at home was mindful of its duty, and clergy came as fast as they were needed. In 1619, there were enough counties settled to send delegates who organized the first representative assembly in America. They met to establish self-government on this continent. By a strange irony, while they were in session, a Dutch ship, the "Jesus," brought to Jamestown and sold the first cargo of African slaves.[1]

First representative assembly.

With the civil legislation of the Assembly we are not directly concerned. But their acts relating to religion show a vivid picture of the place and time. It was enacted[2] that: —

Care should be taken by the officers that the people resort to church on the Sabbath Day, the penalty of absence to be a pound of tobacco, or for a month's absence fifty pounds; that all who till the ground, of what quality soever, pay tithes to the minister; that there be throughout the colony an uniformity of Doctrine and Worship; that Ministers and Church Wardens present to the Midsummer Assizes a return of official acts, and also the names and offences of all persons of profane and ungodly life, common swearers, drunkards, blasphemers, neglecters of the Sacraments, Sabbath-breakers, adulterers, forni-

Laws concerning religion.

[1] Williams: History of Negro Race in America, vol. i. p. 116.
[2] Anderson: vol. i. p. 460.

cators, slanderers, and also of all Masters and Mistresses who neglect to catechise their children and servants; that no man shall disparage or speak lightly of a Magistrate or Minister, or be married other than by the Book of Common Prayer; that Ministers shall preach at each of their stations at least once a year; that they shall visit any one who is dangerously sick; shall administer the Sacrament at least three times a year; shall not drink to excess, dice or play cards for money; that each minister shall have a hundred pounds of tobacco per year, and also the twentieth calf, pig, and kid, these to be kept by the owner till weaned and then rendered by the Church Warden at a time and place publicly fixed; that if the Church Warden fail to render them the value be collected from him by distress; that the fee for each marriage shall be two shillings, for christening nothing, for churching one shilling, and for burying one shilling; that the cost of raising and repairing churches shall be assessed upon the parishes; that the members of the Legislature shall attend Divine Service "upon the thyrde beatinge of a drume" under a fine of two shillings sixpence.

Spirit of the laws.

The resemblance of these enactments of the Episcopalians of Virginia to those soon to be passed by the Puritan colony of Massachusetts will suggest itself at once. But when the two legislations come to be compared, both in matter and in spirit, the difference will be still more evident. They both trespass upon what seems to us to be liberty of conscience. But there is an inquisitory particularity

of interference with personal rights, and a savage religiosity, in the Puritans' laws, which is not present in those of the Churchmen. They approached their task of law-making with radically different tempers and purposes. The Virginians were content when they had made such regulations as they deemed necessary to the well-being of society. The Puritans felt themselves responsible for the present and eternal destiny of the individual. The Churchmen legislated for this life only, and had sufficient understanding to fulfil their task fairly well. The Puritans legislated for the life eternal. It was because they encroached upon the prerogatives of God that they made havoc of men.

At first the acts of the Assembly were easily enforced; in fact they enforced themselves. They but expressed the wishes of the people in the premises. But with the increase of immigration the character of the population changed. At first it was all of those who were emphatically "for Church and Crown." The wives kindly sent out to the settlers were all Church-women. The Archbishop of Canterbury was their patron, and the Bishop of London was a director in the company. But as the country opened up, and the tobacco and fur trade became more lucrative, men of another sort began to come. Men who sat loosely to both Church and Crown came for fortunes, and Puritans and Quakers came for broader liberty. These last were not molested. The not very onerous tax needed to support the Establishment, regularly levied, was paid by them without any evidence of reluctance. A

man in Virginia was much more ready to pay his tax to support a Church whose advantages for himself and his children he could have for the asking, than was a man in Massachusetts to support an Establishment whose spiritual benefactions were denied him until he should first pass a rigorous examination as to his own spiritual state. What men always and everywhere rebel against is the application of a human test to separate the sheep from the goats. In Massachusetts the sheep were marked and goats were branded. In Virginia sheep and goats were both alike shorn for the support of the fold which was open to them both. Little by little the Church relaxed its laws, and we must say also, its manners. Plantation life grew easy and abundant. Theology never throve in it. The clergy began to be planters on their own account, and were content, for the most part, to be good men and good neighbors. Missionary zeal slowly died out. The Dissenters built their meeting-houses undisturbed, sometimes aided by the gift of a generous slice of land from the parson's own plantation. Colonel Esmond is a fair type of the Virginia Churchman, who began to be seen half a century earlier than Thackeray places him. The colony grew to be peaceful, prosperous, and safe. Complacent, with no very exalted ideals either in religion or morals, its general loyalty to Church and Crown remained unchanged. When the Commonwealth came, the Virginians utterly refused to recognize the disestablishment of the Church in England, and ignored the Perfect Model of the "Saints." At the Restoration

Relaxation of manners.

they pursued the even tenor of a way they had never interrupted. When the eighteenth century opened, the Church was recognized by the law, and, upon the whole, contained the people, of the colony.

From it we now turn to look at that rival English people who first became its neighbors in the New World.

CHAPTER III.

THE PURITANS.

To comprehend the Puritans in New England we must first look at them in Old England. The Acts of "Uniformity" and "Supremacy" precipitated the confused ecclesiastical life in England into its three component ingredients, Churchmen, Romanists, and Independents. They compelled men to range themselves. It took half a generation for them to find out definitely to which camp each belonged, but it created the necessity for an ultimate choice, however long it might be postponed. The three camps were very unequal in size. The Romanists were few in numbers and utterly discredited in the eyes of the people, in point of their faith and their loyalty.

Churchmen and "Puritans," however, were not very unequal in weight and numbers. Romanists and Puritans complained of the same grievances. It was the "Supremacy" even more than the "Uniformity" which burdened their souls. They might possibly have borne the enforced Liturgy, which was less an abomination before it was enforced. This they could have learned to endure, and might have learned to love. At worst, this only constrained their conduct. But the Supremacy touched their souls. To the Romanist, the Supreme Head of the Church was

Not unequal division.

Christ, and the Pope his vice-gerent. To the Puritan the Supreme Head of the Church was Christ, and He had and could have no vice-gerent. To compel one upon his faith as a Christian to swear allegiance to any secular authority, was not tolerable. Romanist and Puritan alike held that between the Church and the State there could be no compact made as between equals, but that in the organization of society the secular must be subordinate to the spiritual. The Puritan could not find it in his conscience to answer before any civil tribunal for his religious conduct, much less to swear upon his faith as a Christian that he would acknowledge any mortal man, even though he be King of England, as "Supreme Head of the Church." It was worse than Popery! It was a doctrine of devils! It was Antichrist! He would go to jail first; he would fight; he would emigrate, and found a society where Antichrist would not be allowed to exalt himself into the seat of God; a society in which the saints should rule as they had the right to reign.

To the Churchman this position was incomprehensible. To his mind, England was simply a nation com-

Churchmen's theory.

posed of Christian men, in which the Church and the State were not differentiated and could not be. The King as head of the realm was head of the Church, *ipso facto*. To quarrel with it was like quarrelling with the structure of the human body or the solar system. The man who did so must either be mad or have some sinister motive which he hid behind the plea of a tender conscience. It was as reasonable and natural for King and Parliament to decree a doctrine

as to levy a tax, to punish a heretic as to imprison a thief, — for were they not both offenders against the common order? For any man to boggle at avowing his allegiance to the powers ordained by God, was to avow himself a bad citizen, and bad citizens should be made to feel the hand of the law.

The Pilgrims.

One little group of men there was who were wise beyond their time. They saw even then that religious and secular things each had their own sphere. They perceived that while the Church is "the blessed company of all *faithful* people," it has its existence in a world filled with all people. They saw that while Christians live in the State they must, perforce, have relations with it. They dreamed of no theocracy where the saints should reign as the chosen of God; but they did dream of a state where the things that belong to God and the things that belong to Cæsar might be mutually apportioned in peace. Under the lead of their good pastor, John Robinson, a priest of the Church of England, and one of the noblest men of his own or any time, this little band of pilgrims set upon their wanderings in search of their new Canaan. They sought it first in Holland. But after half a generation their hearts turned back to Merrie England. They wished their children to retain their mother tongue. There was not room for them and theirs in the dyke-belted Low Countries. To England they could not return. Their thoughts roved over the sea to where the English flag was planted on an unpossessed land. The good ship Mayflower carried them away, and in 1620 they landed in Plymouth Bay. But they

were men born out of due time. Their little company never grew large. Their pious leader said of them, more truly than he knew, that "they knew they were pilgrims, and looked not much on the things of earth, but lifted up their eyes to heaven, their dearest country, and quieted their spirits." "Deeply touched as all must be by the idyllic grace of the story of the Pilgrims, and pleasant as it is to linger over it, yet candor compels us to acknowledge that the true genesis of New England life is not to be traced to Plymouth, and that the Pilgrims had no direct and but little indirect influence in shaping its later development." [1]

The Salem colony.

It was with the Puritan colony who landed in Massachusetts Bay in 1629 that the New England life really began. Five ships brought them over, two hundred and fifty strong. The projector of the enterprise was Arthur Lake, the Puritan Bishop of Bath and Wells. He declared that if he were not so old he would go out with the colony himself.[2] It is interesting to speculate what might have been the development of Puritan New England if Bishop Lake had come! But all the colonists were members of the English Church. Their leader was Rev. John White, Vicar of Dorchester. Francis Skelton of Clare Hall, and Francis Higginson of Jesus College, Cambridge, Episcopal Ministers both, were forward in the enterprise. Why, then, did a company of English Churchmen, led by priests, and with a bishop for their patron, leaving home with words of love for their Mother on

[1] Bishop Harris: Christianity and Civil Society, p. 95.
[2] Bancroft: vol. i. p. 264, last edition.

their lips, become her sullen and relentless foes? It is not necessary and would not be true to charge them either with hypocrisy or ingratitude. The logic of events is more potent than the theories of man. The root of the quarrel was partly in the situation and partly in the unconscious temper of the men themselves.

English theory of the Church.

The theory of England was that every subject of the realm was a member of the Church. The relation established a mutual obligation. It formed the basis for protection and control on the one side; it created the duty of obedience and support on the party of the second part. The King was to be a nursing father to the Church, but a father whose counsels must be heeded under penalty. The leaders of the Church naturally subscribed to the theory. They were glad to believe that Church and State were each necessary to the other, but they made the sad blunder of identifying the State with the Crown. They hailed as almost divine wisdom the apothegm of the "wisest fool in Christendom," when he summed up the whole situation in his famous words, "No bishop, no king."[1] They established the ill-omened conjunction of Episcopacy and Monarchy. It did not occur to them that the obverse of James I's aphorism might sometime be deemed true, — No king, no bishop. It seemed to them that they were doing well and wisely by linking Episcopacy to that institution which seemed to the world of their

[1] Graham: Colonial History of the United States, vol. i. p. 139. Whitgift did not scruple to declare that "undoubtedly his Majesty spoke by the special assistance of God's Spirit."

day the most abiding of all things. But their mistake well-nigh worked ruin to the Church. It led it to form that fatal friendship with the Stuarts which brought Episcopacy into discredit with half of England, extinguished it in Scotland, and made it impossible for a hundred and fifty years in America. This ill-starred alliance remained as a sentiment many a year after it had degenerated from a mere mistake of judgment to a very inanity. There are probably not wanting Churchmen even yet who, in defiance of the facts of history, and with slight regard for the honor of the Ten Commandments, still think and speak of "the blessed martyr, King Charles."[1] And this in the face of the fact that, with the single exception of poor Queen Anne, the Church has never had a whole-hearted friend on the English throne, from the time of James I. until now.

Puritans and their theory.

Now, when the Puritans left England they unconsciously turned their backs to the theory upon which the Church had taken its stand. Even had the theory been true, it would have been impossible of application to a people angered for other causes, and farther away from the machinery of government than now would be a colony on Lake Nyanza. When they landed, and saw the situation, they saw they had expatriated themselves. They had left both Church and State behind. The Episcopate, by becoming the creature of the Crown, had lost its power to follow the Church's children. Had the English Church understood

[1] A well-known bishop, still living, tells of a Scotch clergyman who, while visiting in this country, was asked by him before going to Church, if he would object at all to reading the Prayer for the President.

"Hoot, man," was his reply, "dinna I pray for the Hoose o' Hanover?"

then what both her fathers and her sons have known, the true catholic and independent foundation of the Church, she could have adjusted her spiritual machinery to this and all the colonies. But the things which made for her peace were hid from her eyes. The Salem colony saw at once what it took the people of Maryland and Virginia a century to realize, — that the Church of England, holding the theories she did, could never become the Church of the colonies, however deeply she might yearn over her departing children.

But this necessity to live their own life, apart from their old relations, was realized by the Puritans quite as much, or more, through their temper than through their understanding. It was easy for them to reach a conclusion which, though logical, was entirely in accord with their wishes. The Puritan's temper has been his bane, while the Churchman's has been his strong deliverer. The former is now only a character in history, while the latter is a present force, chiefly because, in the long run, moral qualities win over intellectual ones. In the long and weary conflict of the Church with dissent, — that conflict precipitated by the Act of Uniformity, patched up by the Toleration Act of 1688, and only ended within the memory of living men, — the strong weapon of the Church has been a certain broad kindliness of spirit. This, in the Puritans, was wanting. Their sour, saturnine, ultra-logical, disputatious temper led them, in Massachusetts, almost at once to the betrayal of their principles. They had come to found a State. Their ill-regulated enthusiasm changed their purpose, and they set about to found a Church.

The Puritan temper.

The prodigious rapidity of growth which marks the colony shows that there were multitudes like-minded with them. Immigrants came out by the scores and hundreds. In the tenth year after their landing at Salem, a single fleet of twenty ships brought three thousand at one time. Before the colony was twenty years old it had pushed its outposts to the Connecticut, and planted settlements at Windsor and Hartford. They had followed the coast to Saybrook and New Haven, had crossed the Sound to Long Island, and planted a settlement at the mouth of the Housatonic.

And all this was done in the face of a fierce climate, a sterile soil, ferocious savages, and wild beasts. The grimness of the Nature where they struggled reproduced itself again in the tempers of the men. The kindly Englishmen of old Boston and Dorchester became the gloomy, rigid religionists of the new towns which bore the old names. By the middle of the century they had founded fifty towns and villages, in each of which the ministers and magistrates were the sterner censors of the religion and manners of their stern people. From the first it had been determined that none but godly members of the Church should possess the rights of citizenship. This accepted principle could not but beget both fanatics and hypocrites. They were dominated by the idea that they held the place in the New World which the chosen people of God had held in the old economy. They were to go in and possess the land; to destroy utterly the old Canaanites; not to permit a witch to live; to observe all the commandments and statutes of the Lord to do them. They would have none

but Church-members for freemen. They called their children Patience, Faith, Prudence, Deliverance, Thankful, and Hold-fast. Their laws present a picture of their lives.[1] Roman Catholics and Quakers were to be banished, and upon their return executed; shipmasters were forbidden to bring in any of that accursed sect or their writings; it was forbidden to run or walk on the Sabbath Day, except "reverently to meeting;" to sweep the house, to cook, or to shave; mothers were advised not to kiss their children on the Lord's Day; adultery, blasphemy, and idolatry were punishable by death; heresy and keeping Christmas Day, by fine and the stocks; absence from public worship, by fine and whipping; renouncing Church membership, or questioning the canonicity of any book in the Bible, by fine and banishment; all gaming was prohibited and cards and dice forbidden to be imported; dancing anywhere, and kissing a woman in the street, "even in the way of honest salutation," was punished by flogging; women were forbidden under penalty of imprisonment to wear clothing beyond their station in life, to cut their hair like a man; and for speaking ill of the minister, to have their tongues fastened in a split stick.

Puritan laws.

Nor were these decrees empty threats.[2] Extracts

[1] It is hardly needful to say that the oft-quoted "*Blue Laws*" are of no historic value. The authorities are, —

The Book of General Laws and Liberties; by authority of the General Court of Massachusetts 1640; Printed at Cambridge 1660; pp. 3, 8, 9, 26, 33, 35, 38, 69, 74; The same, revised and reprinted by Saml. Green, Cambridge 1672. General Laws and Liberties of Connecticut; Revised and Published by order of General Assembly; Hartford 1672; pp. 28, 37, 21. In illustration of these are the Abridgment of Ordinances of New England; Neal; Hutchison; and Graham: Colonial History of United States. This last has the indorsement of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

[2] Graham: Colonial History of United States, vol. i. p. 189. *Note.*

from the early records of the Massachusetts courts show that John Wedgewood, for being in the company of drunkards, is ordered to sit in the stocks; Catherine, the wife of Richard Cornish, was found suspicious of light conduct and admonished to take heed; Thomas Pettit, for suspicion of slander and stubbornness, to be severely whipped; Josiah Plaistowe, for stealing four baskets of corn, to be hereafter called by the name "Josias and not Mr.," as heretofore. A farmer in the New Hampshire settlement barely escaped excommunication, by confession and repentance, for having killed a bear which was tearing up his garden on Sunday.

One may readily suppose that this unnatural manner of religious life would revenge itself. "*Religentem esse oportet, non religiosum.*" The constant checking and repression of the natural life turned men's minds inward upon themselves. The hard mechanical service of rule was more than they could bear. The story of the internal revolts against it has often been told. The Baptists challenged it, and were coldly told to go elsewhere. The Quakers provoked it, and felt the dreadful weight of its hand. We are only concerned to ask, How shall the Church of England find a lodgement in such a society?

Planting of the Church in New England.

There is a feeble little settlement of Church people on the Kennebec, and the rapidly developing colony in Virginia, but these have their hands more than full with their own affairs. If the Church is to be planted in New England, Old England must do it. No one would have prophesied in 1640 that two centuries and a half later the

most rapid growth of the Episcopal Church would be in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Certainly there was nothing then to indicate it.

When Sir Ferdinando Gorges' son Robert brought his little colony to the "Wessagusset" in 1623, an English clergyman was in the company as chaplain. In the late summer, when the colonists' cabins had been built and their gardens were growing, the chaplain, with a few companions, went for a visit to their neighbors at Plymouth. The first summer voyage of pleasure along the silent coast of Maine was this. The good Plymouth people received their guests with a hearty welcome. The best they had was set before them. In the intolerable loneliness of the grim solitude, a visitor was a godsend. The talk was upon the work in which both settlements were engaged. But the priestly capacity of their guest was silently ignored. As an Englishman and a fellow backwoodsman they would give him of their best. But when the Sunday came he was allowed to take his seat on the benches while their own pastor held forth. The visit was not greatly prolonged and was never repeated.

Even at that early day there were Churchmen in Massachusetts. One of them, John Morton, was a conspicuous figure in the earliest settlements. He had been a rich man and a generous liver in England. The attractive field which the New World offered for adventure and fortune drew him as it did so many of his kind. In 1623 he took up a plantation, including the present town of Quincy. He brought with him thirty servants, stock, utensils, and furniture. With his people about him, on the fat land he lived a

John Morton.

jolly life. Choleric, devout, profane, and generous, he lived in Massachusetts the typical English squire. A tall pole set on the bluff in front of his house bore an English pennant. On Christmas Day abundant roasts of venison and mince pies galore rejoiced his people. Every morning he read prayers before his household, and on Sunday acted as their reader. So long as the kindly Pilgrims were his only neighbors, there was no attempt to interfere with his ways. But when the Puritans came and multiplied, Morton's manners could no longer be tolerated. Presently he had a visit from "that worthy gentleman, John Endicott, of Boston," who grimly ordered the flagpole to be cut down and "to look to it there should be better walking." Morton raged and fumed and was roundly fined for "ungodly speech." He certainly did swear. He declared in a letter to a friend, "I found in these parts two sets of people, Christians and heathens, and these last more friendly and full of humanity." He refused to pay his fine, and was clapped in the bilboes. His servants and tenants were sharply brought into Puritan order. The stout old offender himself was packed off to England and warned to stay there. His offences were gravely asserted to be these two: — being "of a gay humor," and using the Book of Common Prayer. To the mind of the Puritan these were capital. One of them was an offence against the eternal fitness of things, and the other against the solemn judgment of the saints. In England Morton was foolish enough to write a book about his American neighbors. A copy of it found its way to Boston. It was not pleasant reading for "the worthy

Mr. Endicott" and his friends. Still more foolishly, Morton ventured to follow his book himself, and came back to gather up the fragments of his estate. He had better have let it go. No sooner had he returned than he was seized and imprisoned. Several years of such discipline broke the old man's spirit and heart both, and he laid him down and died.

The Brown brothers.

In the original Puritan company were two brothers, Brown by name, a lawyer and a merchant, who declined to join in the action by which the company separated from the Church. They had been born and reared in it, like all the others, and saw no reason why they should turn their backs upon it. When they landed, and had built their little cabins in the new town of Salem, they continued to gather their families morning and evening, and read with them the daily prayers. For a while this was coldly permitted by their neighbors. But presently the brothers ventured to gather a company together in a place distinct from the public assembly, and there "sundry times the Book of Common Prayer was read unto such as resorted thither." This that worthy gentleman Mr. Endicott could not endure. He "convented" the brothers before himself and the ministers. Very plain speech ensued. The ministers argued that the enforced use of the Prayer-Book was the very thing they had not been able to abide on the other side of the water, and that it would be the height of folly to allow it to creep into a place of honor here. The Browns replied, reminding them of the language they themselves had used only a few weeks before, when they had solemnly

declared that they had no notion of separating from the Church their mother, but only to protest against her abuses and corruptions. The Prayer-Book they certainly could not call a corruption, since it had been used till lately by themselves, and was, in substance, either the words of God or of godly men. They accused the ministers openly, and not politely — for they were sturdy Englishmen, these Browns — of being "separatists" and "Anabaptists." The governor and council, however, "finding these two to be of high spirit and their speeches and practices tending to mutiny and faction," — the governor told them that "New England was no place for such as they." The governor was quite right. The New England of that time was no place for any except that peculiar people who had embarked upon their religio-political experiment, nor would it be until that experiment should have been carried out to its necessary failure. The Browns, with their families, were ordered to return to England, which they did within the year, losing their share in the colonial venture.

The Rev. William Blaxton.

While the Salem people were diligently purging their colony of the Church leaven, a Church of England clergyman was quietly living and prospering, far away from neighbors, where Boston now stands. The Rev. William Blaxton was a quiet, peaceable man, who, wearied with the din of religious controversy at home, had come to America to be at rest. He had taken up a farm, built a comfortable house, planted orchards, and made for himself and family a pleasant home, before the Salem people came.

It was not to exercise his ministry he had come, but to escape the strife of tongues. One day in 1630, Winthrop, with a little band of land-hunters, laid down their packs and built their fire at Charlestown. Blaxton's servants reported their presence, and the kindly man brought the cold and hungry hunters to his house. They admired his place "as a paradise," being chiefly delighted with his apples, whose fragrance reminded them of home. From his house they went morning by morning to their clearings, building their cabins in Charlestown, to which they soon removed. New settlers flocked in, and the town of Boston grew apace. Soon Blaxton was surrounded. His peaceful solitude was gone. A town was built and a community organized around him. He was graciously permitted to become a "freeman;" but his Episcopal neighbors Maverick and Walford were denied the same privilege. No attempt was made by Blaxton to hold services of the Church. But gradually and surely he was made to feel that "New England was no place for such as he." When the town passed an order that only those of the "Established Order" should be counted as freemen, thus taking away his citizenship, he sadly accepted its paltry offer of one hundred and fifty dollars for his property, and moved away. "I left England," he says, "because I misliked my lords the bishops: I leave here because I like still less my lords the brethren." Providence, in Rhode Island, afforded him an asylum, as it had Roger Williams. The effect of his removal was to quicken his own zeal in his office. He began at once in his new home to officiate as a minister, and continued to do so until he died, an old man.

Blaxton's removal closed the Prayer-Book in Massachusetts for fifty years. The Churchmen who were in the colony then, as well as the considerable number who came from time to time, conformed with what grace they could to the "Established Order." They went to the meeting-house, had their children baptized by and received the Sacrament at the hands of the Puritan ministers. It was the easier for them to do so for the reason that the early Puritan ministers had been in point of fact Episcopally ordained; and also because the idea of the exclusive validity of Episcopal Orders was not generally entertained at that time by the great majority of Churchmen even in England. By conforming to the Puritan order of things they did violence only to their tastes and habits and not their consciences.

Churchmen in Massachusetts.

But by this time the zeal of the Puritans had grown into bigotry. They were not content with closing the Prayer-Book in their own territory. Massachusetts claimed jurisdiction over the Eastern Colony as well. Nothing less than the suppression of the Church there would content them. By vexatious legal proceedings, and by still harder measures, they, to all practical purposes, succeeded. By 1680 there was only one Episcopal clergyman in the whole of New England. Old Father Jordan still lived in Portsmouth, but broken in fortune and in spirit.

New England had purged herself of all disturbers of the peace. The Baptists had been banished to Rhode Island. The Quakers had been whipped and driven into the wilderness. The Churchmen had been harried

either into conformity or exile. But their success was its own Nemesis.

Withdrawal of the charter.

In 1684 their charter was withdrawn. They had sided with Parliament against the Crown. When the Crown was at last triumphant the enmities they had so diligently cultivated returned to plague them. They might no longer be trusted with the powers of government. The American Theocracy, after a gloomy life of sixty years, fell in a day. By the resumption of the charter, Massachusetts, including all the territory east of the New York line, became a "royal" colony.[1] Its special privileges were gone. Its territory became again part of the kingdom. The Church of England became established in the eyes of English law.

A wide door seemed now to be opened to the Church. But, unfortunately, her champions proved as ready to take the sword as their enemies had been. They had now the secular power on their side. But it was British power. It required still another century of failure before the Church could learn that this which she so fondly believed to be her strength was her hopeless weakness. Meanwhile she exploited it.

Church leaning upon British Government.

On a May day in 1686 the man-of-war Rose sailed into Boston harbor, bearing the first governor and the first incumbent. The ill-starred alliance began its century of failure. Boston had five thousand inhabitants, and three meeting-houses. The frigate arrived on a Thursday. On Sunday the new clergyman read service and preached

[1] Graham: Colonial History of U.S., vol. i. p. 254.

in the Town House. The room was small and ill arranged. But it was packed, and a great crowd of curious hung about the open door and windows. Mr. Ratcliffe was pronounced on all hands to be "an extraordinary fine preacher." Next day a wedding was celebrated, and with a ring! During the week Mr. Ratcliffe formally requested from the Town Council the use of one of the meeting-houses to hold service in. His request was refused, and he was recommended to continue using the Town House. The governor, following his instructions, did not interfere. The people of the town, of whom a considerable number had always held in spirit to the Church of their birth, continued to attend the services in the hall. In June they took steps to organize a parish. A vestry was chosen, composed of Ed. Randolph, Captain Lydgett, Messrs. Luscombe, White, Macartie, Clarke, Turferry, Ravenscroft, and Bullivant. The rector's salary was fixed at $200 a year. They asked for a share of the fund raised by taxation in the town, for the support of public worship, and were refused. Every slight and affront which might safely be used was put upon them. Social pressure in its extremest form was brought to bear against any who might forsake the meeting-house for the Church. But the congregation continued to grow until the mean Town House could in no wise accommodate it. They tried to borrow one of the meeting-houses at such times as it was not in use by its own congregation. They were answered that "we cannot, with a good conscience, consent that our meeting-house should be made use of for the Common-Prayer worship."

Parish organized in Boston.

Upon the arrival of Andros as governor, the situation took on a new complexion. He was too domineering in temper and too pronounced a Churchman to carry out effectively the conciliatory policy which the home government was just then experimenting with. For six months, in obedience to instruction, he put enough constraint upon himself to keep his official hands off. He went with the other Episcopalians to the little Town House and sat upon the hard benches with what dignity and comfort he could. But after six months his ill-disguised impatience broke out. The personal discomfort might have been endured. The hinderance to the growth of the Church, as such, did not disturb him much. But that his Excellency the Governor, the representative of His Royal Majesty, should be stewed week after week in a mean little barn, while the rascally, canting, crop-eared Puritans should be sitting at their ease in comfortable sanctuaries, — this was not to be borne! By the governor's order the "Old South Meeting-House" was appropriated to the new parish for morning service, leaving its own congregation to use it in the afternoon, if they liked. There was no appeal from this order to any human authority. The Puritans therefore changed the venue to a court in which it had always been their peculiarity to believe themselves influential; they appointed and kept a day of fasting and prayer. They also made representations to the governor which led him to partially relax the order. The meeting-house was to be used on alternate Sunday mornings by the two congregations. For

Governor Andros.

Joint use of meeting-house.

some time this arrangement continued. But it worked badly. The Churchmen, when it was their morning in possession, grew strongly rubrical, which made the service so long that the afternoon was half spent before the Puritans could have their turn. When the Puritans were in possession they "had such freedom" in prayer and the expounding of the Word, that no time was left for Evening Prayer. The unseemly spectacle became common Sunday after Sunday of one congregation, shivering in an ill-humor outside, waiting for the one piously chuckling inside to have done and get away. The Church had been placed, as usual, by the governor, in a false position. They had no right to the meeting-house at all, either at law or in equity. In England such a thing as its forcible use would have been impossible, and this the Boston people very well knew. There was nothing for the Church to do but to abandon its claim with what grace it might. They determined to build for themselves. A subscription was started for the purpose, which produced a sufficient amount almost at once. Pity they had not done it six months sooner. For by now the Puritans were so exasperated that they refused to sell a foot of ground for any such purpose. Sewall, in his Diary, writes: "Captain Davis spoke to me to-day for land to set a church on. Told him I could not and would not put Mr. Cotton's land to such a use: first, because I would not set up that which the people of New England came over to avoid; and secondly, the land was entailed!" After repeated failure to make private purchase, the governor came again with heavy hand to the rescue. By pressure and

thinly disguised threats, he persuaded the council to cede enough of common land for the purpose. On it the "King's Chapel" was built, at a cost of $1,800. With a church of its own, the parish grew more rapidly and more wholesomely.

King's Chapel built.

But when the news of the Revolution of 1688 reached New England, and it was learned that the trusty Protestant, and, as they believed, Presbyterian, William of Orange, was on the throne, the Puritans thought their innings had come. Without waiting for accurate information, they clapped Governor Andros into jail, shipped the Episcopal rector off to England, smashed the windows of the church, pelted its walls with mud and filth, mobbed and harried the Churchmen within an inch of their lives. For months the poor, dilapidated church stood silent and desolate, bearing scurrilous extempores scribbled on its walls alluding to Jezebel and the Scarlet Whore.

But the Puritans presently discovered that they had been premature. They learned that William was not the man they had taken him to be. With no enthusiastic love to the Church, — or to anything else, for that matter, — it was now his Church, officially, and must be decently treated. He was as ready to lay his hand upon an ultra-Puritan as an ultra-Papist; and his hand was not a pleasant one to be touched with angrily. The gloomy Bostonians had the mortification to see the rector come back again, with, as they phrased it, "seven other devils worse than himself." The church was rehabilitated, services recommenced, new books, plate, and paraphernalia of worship brought in, the scattered

congregation regathered and increased, and the worship of God by the Common Prayer set up, to grow steadily through two centuries, till now the Church in New England includes in her roll of members the name borne by almost every prominent Puritan in the early annals of the colony. While the Church stood with the Crown against the popular will, they hated her with that sustained and smouldering hatred of which only Puritans were capable. When that unholy alliance was shaken loose, and the Church had the chance to show what she is in herself, the grandsons of her enemies became her loving children.

The quarrel ended.

Thirty years ago a tablet of brass was set in the rebuilt wall of the "Founders' Chapel" of St. Botolph's Church in old Boston, Lincolnshire. It bears an inscription to the memory of John Cotton, the Puritan preacher of new Boston, Massachusetts. When the chapel was re-opened the flags of England and America floated together from the tower, in sign that the old quarrel was over and past. The Bishop of London, Laud's successor, was present, and the Bishop of Lincoln preached fittingly from the text, "Let us build with you, for we seek God as ye do." [1]

[1] Thornton: The Pulpit of the Revolution, p. xxii.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

In the early years of Elizabeth's reign the ambassador of his Most Catholic Majesty of Spain wrote to his master that the royal virgin was, in his judgment, "possessed of a hundred thousand devils." If this were true, it is likely that the task assigned to five legions of them was to harry the English Parliament; the other five were occupied with the Puritans. When James I succeeded, the Romanists came to believe that a wholesale exorcism had been wrought in the kingdom. It was true that James was more of a Protestant than Elizabeth, so far as theological definitions are concerned. Nothing would have pleased the royal theologaster better than a set discussion with the Pope himself; but he differed radically from the leonine queen in temper. He would argue with the Romanists by the week, but he would not cut their heads off. By Elizabeth's method argument is quickly ended, by James's it may be continued.

Lord Baltimore.

This being the king's disposition, when George Calvert, one of his state officers, became a pervert to Romanism in 1624, he did not thereby forfeit the royal favor. He was made Lord Baltimore in lieu of the honorable offices this step compelled him to relinquish. But he thereby cast his lot with a people who had been, upon the whole, fairly judged, and

lay under the popular verdict of bad Christians and untrustworthy Englishmen. For this cause the rights of citizenship had been taken away from them. They held their fortunes and lives by sufferance, and both were often in jeopardy. Calvert made himself intimately acquainted with their situation. His connection by marriage with Sir Thomas Arundel, their chief adviser, gave him opportunity to know their needs and wishes. He was already one of the original members of the Virginia Council. This fact probably suggested his scheme to him. The Puritans had their colony, why should not the Romanists have theirs? They could there escape the social and political disabilities which their fathers had brought upon them, and maybe add a new jewel to the much-battered tiara. In any case, in the New World the priest would not be compelled to disguise himself in Hodge's smock-frock or the livery of a footman, and the people to hear mass with guarded doors, and in deadly fear of the hangman's knife.

The Maryland colony.

Thus Maryland, like the other earliest colonies, started with a distinctly religious motive. It was to be a refuge and a seed-plot for English Roman Catholics.

For this purpose, openly avowed, Lord Baltimore received from Charles I a patent for the territory lying between the mouth of the Potomac and the fortieth degree of north latitude, and running westward indefinitely.[1] Before the charter received the imprint of the Great Seal, Baltimore died. Leonard Calvert, his son, took up his father's task. Romish noblemen and gentle-

[1] Shea: Catholic Church in Colonial Days, p. 34.

men furnished the outfit, and their humbler followers became the colonists. Two ships, the Ark and the Dove, bore the company of a hundred people. They were the best equipped and furnished of all the early companies. They sailed from Cowes, November 22, 1633. After a long and stormy voyage, in which they were driven by stress of weather to the Barbadoes and Montserrat, they entered the mouth of the Potomac, which they consecrated to St. Gregory, and rechristened the two capes which clip its mouth Cape St. Gregory and Cape St. Michael. The islands they sailed by, they called St. Clement, St. Catherine, and St. Cecilia. On this last they landed, and the two Jesuits sent by their provincial with the expedition, Father Andrew White and Father John Altham, said mass for the company on Annunciation Day, 1634. Thence they moved to the Maryland shore, and unloaded their goods at St. Mary's. "There," says Bancroft, "religious liberty obtained a home, its only home in the wide world."

This last declaration has been so often made, that in the interest of common justice it should be qualified and supplemented. Things which differ ought to be distinguished. That Roman Catholics should be claimed as the champions of religious liberty in the seventeenth century, seems sufficiently grotesque to the student of history.[1] The simple truth in the premises is this: the Calverts did believe and practise so; the Roman Church did neither the one nor the other. The settlers of Maryland were

Romanists and religious liberty.

[1] This claim was the burden of the addresses at the Roman Catholic Conference at Baltimore in October, 1889.

too glad to find safety to think of persecution. Not that they would have done so if they could. They should have, ungrudged, their meed of praise; but they must not have all the praise. It must not be forgotten that their new home was given them by a Protestant king, with the hearty advice and approval of a Protestant council, who in so doing waived their own claims in the interest of their misguided but still loved countrymen. They made the gift with their eyes open. English Romanists were utterly discredited as citizens. It was not alone or chiefly that their religion was abhorrent. By their own declaration they took their political orders from an enemy whom England could not then afford to despise. Romanists in England meant servants of the Papacy and agents of the king of Spain. Despite of this, Protestant Englishmen gave them that peaceful home in Maryland, which had already been brutally refused them by their French co-religionists in Newfoundland.[1] The founders were of those few in their day who were Catholics rather than Romanists, and Englishmen before either. Such were the Calverts, a noble race with few contemporaries and fewer descendants. They had neither the will nor the power of intolerance. But they laid no claim to toleration as a virtue. They simply recognized existing facts. The first offer of persecution by the Maryland colony would have brought such a storm about them as would have swept them into the ocean. Churchmen and Quakers, Baptists and Puritans, would have combined to exterminate the ingrates.

Persecution by them impossible.

1 Shea: Catholic Church in Colonial Days, p. 32.

They were glad to leave England, and there is serious reason to believe that they were not altogether sorry to be three thousand miles farther away from Rome. Their chosen priests were Jesuits, and the Society of Jesus was not then in favor at Rome. It had already launched upon that policy of adaptability to every circumstance, which made it distrusted and finally led to its suppression by the Pope himself. Dominicans, Capuchins, and Franciscans were those whom Rome then looked upon with favor. The judgment of the Roman Church was at one with that of the Puritan upon this question. Cotton Mather spoke for both when he pronounced "toleration — a doctrine of devils." The Calverts and their friends were as far removed from the spirit of their Church as from that of their times. They were never looked upon kindly by their spiritual superiors, and when the last of them returned to England the Romish King, James II, refused to receive him.[1]

Slow growth of the colony.

This colony, with its exceptional advantages of equipment, soil, and climate, filled up more slowly than any of its compeers. At first the immigrants were of the same faith as the founders. But this supply of men was quickly exhausted. The truth was, there were few of that sort among the English-speaking people to draw from. The stream of immigration soon became Protestant. Before a generation had passed, these last were in the majority; before the end of the century they were ten to one.[2] While there

[1] Hawks: Ecclesiastical Contributions, vol. ii. p. 56.
[2] Ib. p. 73; Shea, p. 26.

was no religious establishment, the offices of the province were all rigidly kept in the hands of Roman Catholics, and this even after they had become less than one-tenth of the population. No open obstacle was placed in the way of Protestant worship, but any official advantage available was lent to that of Rome. Occasional services of the Church of England were held almost from the first, by clergy from Virginia, from New England, and by occasional visitors from England. In a few places services were kept up with regularity for considerable periods, but the record of them in detail is not now extant.

In Cromwell's time the Commonwealth sent over a commission to set up the "New Model," and Romanists and Churchmen were both suppressed.

At the Restoration things returned to the same state as before.

Ten years later the Roman Catholic population had been engulfed.[1] The Italian plant in America had withered, and did not revive again, till the stream of Irish immigration poured over it in the middle of this present century.

When this condition had been reached, the people of Maryland effected, rightly, the "Protestant Revolution." A petition to the Crown was offered praying that the offices of the province might be placed in the hands of Protestants, who constituted its people. It was right and just, on the Calverts' own principles, that this should be done. Nor did their descendants and successors strongly oppose it.

[1] Shea, p. 75.

The first clear view of the Church's career there begins in 1675. A Mr. Yeo, of Patuxent, writes to the Archbishop of Canterbury, —

"The Province of Maryland is in a deplorable state for want of an established ministry. Here are ten or twelve counties, and in them at least twenty thousand souls, and but three Protestant ministers of the Church of England. The Lord's Day is profaned, religion is despised, and all the notorious vices are committed, so that it is become a Sodom of uncleanness and a pest of iniquity."

The picture drawn by Mr. Yeo is probably too deeply colored, but there is abundant testimony that that pestilent class had multiplied rapidly which has since become the bane of the United States. "Bad Catholics" have always been the worst of the population, — while good ones have been as good as any. The only authority which they have been reared to recognize as really binding is the Church. When they or their children break away or lapse from under it, there is nothing to take its place. The intrinsically divine quality of civil government, which has always been one of the underlying beliefs of Protestantism, is unknown by them. In their eagerness to accent the divine nature of the Church, they have emptied everything else of its divinity. When they break with it they are left wandering stars. In the present day they form a great proportion of the inmates of jails and penitentiaries. In the last years of the seventeenth century they were at large in Maryland. The Roman Catholic Church had almost completely lost its hold on its own

"Bad Catholics."

children. It was not for a hundred years later that they were able to support their first bishop. When Madison went to England for consecration, John Carroll, the Roman Catholic, was his shipmate on his way to accomplish a similar errand.

The lapsed Romanists were mingled with lapsed Churchmen, Quakers destitute of the "inner light," Baptists, and a few Scotch Presbyterians. They were practically all planters. The evil effect of African slavery upon the masters was beginning to show itself. They were overbearing, indolent, and licentious, — the three besetting sins of slave-keeping people. Dancing, drinking, horse-racing, cock-fighting, were their serious occupations.[1] Their charter was revoked in 1690, like those of Massachusetts and New York, in pursuance of the home policy which had determined to bring the colonial territory out of its anomalous political status, and restore it to its place as a part of the common possessions of the kingdom. By this act of the Crown, — not the colonists themselves, — the ecclesiastical balance was overturned. The people came back under English law. By that law the Romanist as such was proscribed. His very existence became treason. By the same law the English Church was part of the machinery of the realm. It needed no new statute for either. The existing laws sufficed. The Church of England was now the established Church of Maryland. Clergy began to come apace, but of a character and quality so indifferent that their presence wrought, if possible,

Charter revoked.

[1] Lodge: English Colonies in America, p. 127 et seq.
[1] McMaster: History of People of United States, vol. i. pp. 424, 425.

more harm than their previous absence had done. It is evil for a people to have no priests; it is still worse to have bad ones. The first Maryland priest we catch sight of is of this sort. John Coode, a politician, a mountebank, a land-surveyor, a Jack-of-all-trades, had been mixed up with all the broils of the colony, was always to be found at his post after the fight, when the spoil was being gathered. He had been most forward in the petition to have the colonial offices turned over to Protestants, and had secured two or three of them for his share. The duties of one of them called him to England. While there he managed to have himself ordained to the ministry. Upon his return he began at once to officiate. It can readily be imagined how much good he did. His character grew from bad to worse. Without giving up either his sacred or secular office he added to them both that of customs officer. At odd times he surveyed a plantation and bowsed all the evening with the owner. He was so drunk once during service on Sunday that Governor Nicholson, who was in the congregation, led him out and caned him handsomely, — and was challenged by him for the indignity. He went up and down the colony preaching on Sunday, and lecturing during the week, on "The Absurdities of Christianity," — a sort of seventeenth-century Ingersoll in spurs and cassock. Finally his conduct became so intolerable that he was arrested, tried for general misbehavior, and banished from the colony.

Unworthy ministers.

It must not be supposed that all the priesthood were such as this, the first we meet. The earliest missionaries

had been devout and godly men, and some such still remained. But for the most part they had passed away. Now that plantation life had grown easy, and a ready fortune was to be gathered, and the people themselves had declined in manners, so many of Coode's sort came that we shall find ministerial unworthiness to be a painful feature of the Church for more than a generation, — indeed, in the Southern colonies, quite up to the Revolution.

Situation in 1700.

When the year 1700 had been reached, the position of the Church in the province of the Calverts was, roughly, this. There were about twenty-two thousand inhabitants, nine-tenths of them nominally Protestants, a turbulent and ill-regulated populace. The Church of England was established by law. A poll-tax of forty pounds of tobacco was assessed for its support upon every rate-payer. There were about half a dozen clergy. The people were in many places anxious both for more and better ones. They forwarded petitions to the Bishop of London and Canterbury frequently to this end. A curious fact is that the signers of these petitions constantly called themselves "Protestant-Catholics." Did they anticipate by two centuries a true conception of the Church? Were the two classes so fused together in the common population that they simply described themselves?

The Establishment was most unpopular, even in the eyes of the stanchest Churchmen. The tax of tobacco was evaded, or else paid in an herb of so poor a quality that even Parson Samson raised his gorge at it.

The ecclesiastical history of the colony has been well summed up in the words of a modern writer:

"There were three eras of toleration in Maryland. That of the proprietaries, which lasted fifty years. Under it all believers in Christ were (theoretically) equal before the law, and all support to churches and ministers was voluntary.

"That of the Puritans, which lasted six years, and included all but Romanists, Episcopalians, and heretics.

"The Anglican toleration, which lasted eighty years, had glebes and churches for the Establishment, connivance for Dissenters, penal laws for Catholics, and from all the *forty pounds per poll*." [1]

[1] American Commonwealth Series, Maryland, p. 186.

CHAPTER V.

THE DUTCH.

THE early settlements were established, one after the other, on the banks of Albemarle Sound, Chesapeake, Massachusetts, New York, and Delaware Bays. To the three first and the last the colonists came impelled either entirely or dominantly by religious motives, and all came from England. The New York settlement sprang from religious motives only indirectly. Remotely, the Reformation was its occasion. That had divided Europe into two hostile camps. For half a century they strove to settle on the field that quarrel between the Pope and the Augustinian monk, which had failed of adjustment by argument. Slowly the war concentrated itself into the Netherlands, the historic battle-ground of Europe. In that arena Rome broke herself against the indomitable Dutch. But these could strike, as well as endure. While they stubbornly defended themselves at home, they aimed a blow at their Spanish enemy's remotest border. The English skipper, Henry Hudson, with a sturdy Dutch crew in the ship Half Moon, was sent to ravage the Spanish possessions in the Farther Indies. In September, 1609, they passed inside Sandy Hook, and fancied they might before evening drop their anchor in front of Singapore.[1] The great

Seeking the East Indies.

[1] Parkman: Discovery of the Great West, p. xxi.

river they were in, and the Straits of Malacca, to their minds, covered the same space upon the map. An unsuspected continent and an unknown ocean lay between them and their purpose. Their voyage of war became changed perforce to one of discovery and adventure; for trading with Indians would be quite as profitable as fighting with Lascars. Bears and wolverines were plenty on either side of Hudson's River, mink and otter abundant along the Sound, and muskrats swarmed about the Haarlem flats. Barter with the natives was easy, and Hudson's crew went home both earlier and richer than they had expected. Their report soon led to other expeditions for the same purpose. A fort and a cluster of cabins sprang up on Manhattan Island. In 1619 the United Provinces gained their hard-won independence. Immediately there sprang up among them the same movement of adventure and colonization which had shown itself among the English upon their peace with Spain. The "Dutch West India Company" was organized. The United Provinces gave it leave to found a state in America. Leave was all they gave it. They warned the colonists that they went on their own responsibility, and took their own risk. They must "look to the Provinces for nothing but friendly patronage." In 1625 the advance guard of thirty families came. For twenty-four dollars they bought Manhattan Island for their own, and began at once to build their town about the block-house of the fur-traders.

It is their ecclesiastical future with which we have to do. After two centuries and a half shall have passed

over, we will find the names borne by these Dutch immigrants in the Church, — Stuyvesants, De Peysters, Livingstons, Schuylers, Bleeckers, and Remsens. By what steps, and through what influences, have they come?

Ecclesiastical position of the Dutch.

They came here Presbyterians, but Presbyterians of a very different type, and with other traditions, than those we shall find across the Church's path later on. In their long war with the Papacy their bishops had taken sides against them. When the Episcopate runs away, only the Presbyterate is left. The Dutchmen's theory of the Presbytery came after the fact. In such a case the theory is not held aggressively. Their theology was not of the fierce Calvinistic sort. It was broader, more kindly, and more human. The "Church idea" has never been wanting in them or their descendants. They had become Presbyterian from necessity, and continued to be so from wont and use rather than from conscience. Five years after their town of New Amsterdam was started, their first minister came out. Fifty communicants and more greeted him. The colony grew rapidly. Soon the island was too strait for them, and they pushed out to search new places. They ascended the Hudson, and followed the Mohawk till its branches interlaced with the Susquehanna. Adrian Block passed through the Sound, and left his name on Block Island. Captain May followed the Jersey coast till he reached the cape which bears his name. They plodded eastward until they confronted the Puritans on the Housatonic. This was a significant meeting. It was the old problem in physics

The Dutch as settlers.

of an irresistible body meeting an immovable one. It was followed by a whole generation of contest, sometimes by words, then by threats, and even by blows. Roger Williams came all the way from Providence to arbitrate between them, and gained the ill-will of both.

Toleration.

The Dutch had learned religious toleration in a hard school, and had learned their lesson well. In New York alone, of all the colonies, absolute religious liberty subsisted from the start. Even in Penn's colony no "Jew, Turk, Infidel, or heretic" might live. New York gave a home to everything that is human. There the Jew first set foot in America. Lutherans, Puritans, Presbyterians, Huguenots, and Quakers dwelt undisturbed. Even when choleric old Peter Stuyvesant harried the Quakers and Lutherans, it was to satisfy a personal grudge, and his conduct was not sustained by the people. Dutch, French, and English were spoken, each by so many that public documents required to be in all three tongues.

But this prosperous Dutch colony was occupying British soil, and now their place was wanted. They had come without leave asked, and had been warned by their own government, in advance, not to look to it for help. The mouth of the Hudson was within the Virginia Company's grant. That company had resigned to the Crown what was needed for Massachusetts and Maryland, but not for New Netherlands. It was now wanted for the King's brother, the Duke of York. The Dutch were warned to vacate, but placidly sat still. On the 8th of September, 1664, the Duke's fleet, with

Colonel Nichols, dropped anchor off the island. Stout Peter Stuyvesant, then governor, stormed in vain. The Dutch would not fight, neither would they run away. They went about their work serenely. Their governor ungraciously capitulated for them, stipulating that "the Dutch shall enjoy liberty of conscience here in divine worship and church discipline."[1]

Coming of the English Church.

Colonel Nichols landed with his staff and his chaplain, bringing the English flag and the English Church. Their coming did not strikingly change the ecclesiastical situation. Colonel Nichols was himself a Churchman, but of a mild type. He made no attempt at propagandism. His own chaplain read prayers and preached in the little log chapel of Fort James alternately with the Dutch dominie, and, later on, the Roman Catholic priest. For thirty years this indifference continued. The Dutch had their meeting-houses; the Huguenots had their chapel; the Baptists had theirs; and the Quakers met from house to house; but the Church's voice was not heard beyond the garrison's drum-beat. When Governor Andros came the situation changed. His truculent Churchmanship asserted itself here as it had done in Boston. He found, however, that the Dutch were more difficult to deal with than even the Puritans. They would not actively oppose his projects, much less fly into a religious fury, but their stolid inertia baffled even the domineering governor. He passed away soon to another province, leaving the Church circumscribed as narrowly as it had been before he came, but bearing now the burden of popular dislike which he had created.

[1] Capitulation: Article viii.

It was not till 1690, after the Dutch Stadtholder had become the English King, that the Church began to grow. The change of dynasty had its effect. The Dutch in New York no longer deemed themselves foreigners. The King spoke their tongue far better than he did English. He was a member of their Church as well as an Episcopalian. If their beloved Prince of Orange found it easy to be a Churchman, why should not they do likewise? Even if they did not become so formally, their feeling toward the Church became greatly modified. The only thing they boggled at was giving up their beloved Dutch tongue. They stood out against this, but in vain. The young people understood English, and grew to dislike their fathers' speech. They clamored for English in their services. When the elder people refused to allow it, the younger turned to the Church.

In 1692 Governor Fletcher persuaded the Assembly to pass an "Act to make provision for the ministry in every county." It districted the province into parishes, provided for an assessment to sustain public worship, and put it within the governor's right to nominate "a worthy Protestant minister" in each. It is clear that the Assembly used the term "Protestant minister" in its widest sense. They were themselves almost all Dutch Presbyterians. But the governor declared that he was constrained to interpret the Act in accordance with the law of the realm. Wherever that law met the phrase "Protestant minister," it understood by it a minister of the Established Church. If the Assembly meant something else, they

Church establishment.

should have said what they meant. They had used the legal phraseology, and by it they had unintentionally established the Church of England in New York! He would nominate none but Churchmen to the parishes, and the tax must be expended for them. It seems at this distance like sharp practice. In Massachusetts it would have brought such a storm about the governor's ears as would have swept him off the coast. But the Dutch do not seem to have very seriously resented it. The truth was, it was rather a barren victory for the Church. The Assembly had the machinery for taxation in their own hands, and they would not be likely to set it going under the circumstances. The governor nominated a rector or two in Long Island, but no salary was forthcoming, and the appointees could not live in these parishes. But the Act, and the governor's interpretation of it, placed the Church legally in possession. It fenced all others out.

When the English-speaking Presbyterians, immediately afterward, organized their first society, they found they could not take title to the land where they wished to build their church. But the General Assembly of the (Established) Presbyterian Church of Scotland came to their relief. A committee of that body, a corporation known to the laws of the realm, held their title for them, and they went on with their building.

Plan for the Episcopate.

While the Presbyterians were thus trying to start their society, and the phlegmatic Dutch were seemingly indifferent to the whole matter, the Rev. Mr. Miller, the chaplain of the fort, elaborated a scheme for the Church's good, which, if it had been

carried out, would have changed the future ecclesiastical history of America. His plan was to have a Bishop sent out. He proposed that the Bishop of London should consecrate a suffragan for New York. There was nothing to hinder. The province was a Crown colony. The Church was now established. The Bishop of London was its Ordinary. He could not look after it himself. Why not appoint a suffragan? Miller's plan was, as he states, "to use the King's Farm, at present a very ordinary thing, yet will admit of considerable improvement," for the Bishop's seat; that a subscription be started to put the farm in order, and to build a Bishop's Church; that the large sums of money now raised in England for missionary purposes be administered by the Bishop of New York; that "five or six sober young ministers be brought over with Bibles and Prayer-Books and other things convenient for Churches, so that the Bishop with these powers, qualifications, and supplies, would in a short time, through God's assistance, be able to make great progress in the settlement, and in the correction of vice." The plan was in every way feasible, and is almost the only one of all the plans for the Episcopate which was so. At this time there would have been no difficulty in the way. The Dutch would not have opposed it, and it is hardly too much to say that they would have welcomed it. Twenty-five years later it would have been impossible in any of the colonies. By that time the idea of an ultimate separation from the mother country had found a lodgement. No institution not already here, which might seem to knit the bonds more tightly, would be

tolerated. In 1695 this was not the case. Loyalty was then universal, and dissent was only in its second generation. It had not gained the strength of prescription. What really did stand in the way of this and every other attempt to secure the Episcopate here was the extensive and minute ignorance which obtained among English Churchmen concerning colonial affairs. The idea of a Bishop in the American wilderness was as grotesque to them as now would be the suggestion of a professor of the higher mathematics among the Zulus. It was not till fifty years later that Berkeley saw the star of empire westward take its way. And vision as clear as his was just about as common as seers always are. Poor Chaplain Miller's well-digested plan was not even considered. It was not possible a second time for a whole century.

Meanwhile the Church people of New York drew together and organized Trinity Parish in 1697. The Church made all the freeholders of the town electors to choose wardens and vestrymen; made the Bishop of London rector at a salary of one hundred pounds a year; the salary was to be raised by assessment upon real estate; the new church was to be, as the royal representative phrased it, "our sole and only parish church and churchyard in this our said City of New York."

Trinity Church.

The Church was built, and is described as "standing very pleasantly on the banks of Hudson River, and has a large cemetery on each side, and is enclosed in front by a painted paled fence. Its revenue is restricted by Act of Assembly to five hundred pounds,

but it is possessed of a farm at the north end of the city, which is lately rented, and will in the course of a few years, it is hoped, produce a considerable income."

The hope seems to have been well founded.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SOUTH RIVER.

THE Hudson was the "North River," the Delaware the "South River." To find the colonists for this last, we must cross to the continent as we did for the Hudson. We will bring settlers of a foreign speech, but of a church akin to the English.

The Swedes.

When the great Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, laid down his life on the field of Lutzen, his great chancellor, Oxenstiern, took up his master's task as best he might. He cast about to find where his reformed Swedes might be safe from their ancient enemy. Like the other leaders of his time, his thoughts turned to America. Under the chancellor's patronage, Peter Minuit organized his little colony, and landed with them at Wilmington, 1637. They were Lutheran Episcopalians. Sweden had been fortunate enough to come out of the storm of her reformation with her Hierarchy standing; somewhat damaged, to be sure, but sufficiently secure to gain recognition. The Minister who came with the Swedish colony, and his brethren who followed him, had all been episcopally ordained. They had a history, a liturgy, a church life. When they came in contact with the English Church at Philadelphia and Wilmington, they coalesced with it

without any questions asked on either hand.[1] But they did not meet with friendly Englishmen. Their nearest neighbors were the Dutch on the Hudson and in the Jerseys. These were a sturdy, thrifty people, who knew good land when they saw it. They had no notion of allowing the Swedes to intrude. That they themselves had no rights, did not affect the question. They had possession. Frequent expeditions were sent out from New Amsterdam to drive the Swedes away from the Delaware. These expeditions were badly managed, and in fact the old soldiers of Gustavus were more than a match for the fur-traders of the Hudson. They held their own and increased until sturdy Peter Stuyvesant undertook the task of conquest. But the Dutch victory was short-lived. Hardly had Stuyvesant returned victorious when Colonel Nichols with the English fleet appeared in the East River, and the Dutch and Swedes both lost their titles. New Netherlands and New Sweden both passed back without a struggle under the British crown. A few recruits continued to come to the lower counties, but not enough to leave permanently any trace of their speech, their church, or their habits, in the New World. Their few parishes, at Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Chester, passed gradually into the Church of England, and were absorbed. Two or three quaint old churches, always known locally as the "Old Swedes," are all that survive. A hundred and fifty years later the Swedish Episcopacy came in sight

Absorption by the English.

[1] Perry: History of the American Episcopal Church, vol. i. p. 229. Perry: Historical Collections: vol. Pennsylvania, p. 432.

again, in connection with the visit of America's first Bishops to England for consecration, but by that time the two churches, once neighbors, and well acquainted, had drifted so far apart that the Swedes' offer of the bishopric was hardly considered.[1]

George Fox.

The real settlers of the Delaware were preparing in another quarter. In 1640, George Fox, the son of a Leicestershire weaver, was herding sheep for a neighboring farmer. In his solitude he dreamed dreams and saw visions. It was an age of the fiercest theological controversy. For three generations Englishmen had thought and spoken of hardly anything else. All social, political, economical questions were religious ones at bottom. The common people were, and had long been, perplexed and ill at ease. The religious atmosphere was stormy. Men had lost their leaders. In the old days the yokel had not disturbed himself about his soul. That was the priest's business; he was paid for it. But now everything was changed. The old priests were gone, and the new ones were somewhat puzzling. They would give absolution — at a pinch — but they would not warrant it. They would hear confessions, but the penances they imposed were of a new-fangled kind, involving doctrines and experiences which were strange. At church the common man did not know very well how to behave. In one parish he seemed to see the old mass, in another he heard a preacher hold forth in language not clearly intelligible. He heard his neighbors discussing theology continually. Every man had a psalm or a doctrine.

[1] Beardsley: Life of Seabury.

Salvation was no longer the simple thing it had once seemed to be. It could no longer be bought, delivered, and paid for, as it could in the good old days of the grandfathers. What the common people craved was a simple, portable evangel; something which was not mixed up with Spanish marriages, logical tournaments, abstruse doctrines, political policies. Whoever would discover such would be accounted a benefactor.

Fox turned his dreamy eyes within, and found God. The Spirit of God bearing witness with his spirit, — that was the substance of religion. To find the truth, one needs only to commune with his own heart and be still. This "Inner Light" was not only the final but the sole guide which it is safe to follow. It is the simplest of all ideas. It at a single stroke renders superfluous all the machinery of the Church. Why turn to doctor or council, to priest or preacher, if one can look within and see the Holy Ghost? He needed not to be instructed of any man.

Quakerism.

It was natural that Fox's idea should be caught up. Indeed, it was in the air already, and had been for half a century. The Mystics, Mennonites, Anabaptists, Baptists, and "Fifth Monarchy" men in England had all held by it. But it was Fox's strength that he set out the idea in its naked simplicity. All before him had entangled it with questions of social freedom, ecclesiastical organization, fantastic ritual, and what not. Fox held it up in its sheer nakedness. The common people seized upon it as hungry men do bread. It swept over England like a craze. The lanes and

hedges were filled with the preachers of the New Light. They declared that when the light shone within them they did "exceedingly fear and quake," — and the ribald dubbed them "Quakers," at their word. At first they were merely religious enthusiasts, but they quickly became something more. One begins by breaking loose from religious ordinances; it is but a step farther to find one's self beyond the regulations of the State and the family. They became fanatics of a very dangerous sort. All the powers of society were trained upon them to put them down. There seemed good reason for their suppression. Only two generations earlier the Bundschuh had waded in blood through Germany. The peasants' uprising in Elizabeth's day was not forgotten. These Quakers appeared to be setting out on the same path. Those others had also begun by claiming a Divine illumination, and had ended in lust, violence, and cruelty. The magistrates, the priests, the nobility, and the citizens joined hands for their extermination. Then persecution drove them mad. Under its stress they passed into that riotous phase which it is difficult to associate mentally with the restrained, russet-clad folk whom we know by their name. They were impelled by a consuming fire. They "bore their testimony" up and down the earth. One of them bearded the Grand Turk to his face: another tore his cap to rags before Cromwell as a testimony against him. They visited Scotland and Ireland, the West India Islands, and the North American Colonies; they were imprisoned by the Inquisitor at Malta; one brother visited Jerusalem and bore his testimony

Extravagance and repression.

against the superstition of the monks.[1] Naked women, smeared with soot and filth, stalked about the streets and into English churches and New England meeting-houses. They throve upon persecution. They fairly broke into gaol and clamored to be hanged. The criminal law at the time was brutal at the best. Leprous gaols, in which the prisoner was left to starve, the stocks, the pillory, the lash at the cart's tail, the hangman with his searing iron and quartering knife, stood round about the violator of the law or the disturber of the peace. The Quaker was both, and he looked upon the pains which confronted him, not merely serenely but with exalted joy. What could be done with such men?

Efforts to suppress the Quakers.

The law of every land in Christendom was against them. But these laws could not be enforced effectively without a sustained savagery of which Anglo-Saxons have more than once shown themselves to be incapable. The attempt was made. Five thousand of them were in gaol at once.[2] They were threatened, mobbed, pelted, ducked, fined, imprisoned, banished, their ears were cropped, they were laid in the stocks, whipped from market town to market town, shut up in mad-houses, and finally hanged. In the end the persecution gradually ceased, and the Quakers' ill-regulated enthusiasm exhausted itself. But by this time they had become a marked people. They had begun by ignoring the constant fact that religion as a spirit cannot subsist disembodied. They had turned

[1] Rev. Henry Ferguson: in Church Review, January, 1889. (A most admirable article upon the Quaker episode in New England.)

[2] Rowntree: Quakers, Past and Present, p. 72.

their backs upon the sacraments of Christ's appointment, and this violation of a law of God, which is also a law of human nature, revenged itself upon them by compelling them to elevate into sacraments a certain whimsical misuse of pronouns and a fantastic dress. They had also learned self-control. The Spirit no longer possessed them; they possessed it. They became the same self-contained, prudent, negatively good folk their few surviving descendants still are. They had earned and compelled that curious, half-contemptuous good-will which is still accorded to them.

Like all classes who were uncomfortable in Europe, they began to look to America. In 1673, Fox came himself to spy out the land. He made an extended tour of observation from Maine to South Carolina. In every colony, after he left Massachusetts, he found people who looked upon him as one sent of God. Some of them were refugees from England and the Barbadoes, and some were sporadic. After going up and down the coast, he went home and organized a colony of Friends, whose agents bought for them, for five thousand dollars, the western half of Southern Jersey. In 1675 the ship Griffith brought them out and landed them at Salem. To this new settlement Quakers flocked by scores and hundreds. They were left to organize the colony after their own fashion. Religious liberty was its corner-stone. They would persecute no man, they would not even defend themselves. "There," in Bancroft's words, "in 1681, met the first legislative assembly in the world, who said thee and thou to all men, and wore their hats in presence of beggar and

Quakers in New Jersey.

king." Their little colony of Salem remained thriving quietly and developing its own peculiar life until it was brought into touch with the rest of the world by the coming of a larger immigration of the same folk under a leader whose name has become known on two continents.

William Penn.

William Penn is one of the most striking and picturesque figures in history. His father was a choleric English admiral, and his mother a gentle German mystic. When their son was a lad of sixteen, a student at Oxford, he chanced to hear the wandering Quaker preacher Loe, and saw the "Inner Light." His tutors and spiritual pastors and masters labored in vain to withdraw him from the sect with which he cast in his lot, but the enthusiasm was in his blood from his mother. When they could not prevail, they sent him home to his father. The admiral stormed at him, coaxed him, reasoned with him, beat him, but the gentle lad stood firm. Then his father sent him abroad, thinking that change of scene would cure him. He furnished him with letters to the gayest and most fashionable people, thinking to distract him. Penn went to the Continent a dreaming Quaker lad, and returned an accomplished Quaker gentleman. He lived long at the French court, and learned manners in the society to which his renowned father's letters gained him admission. He studied at a Swiss university, and learned the theology of Calvin. He lived with the Mennonites on the Rhine, and found them of his spiritual kin. He returned to England a courtier, a theologian, a philosopher, the master of three living languages and two dead ones, a graceful leader

of the minuet, the most expert small-swordsman in Europe, and a Quaker still. He inherited his grandfather's great fortune, and won the friendship of the dissolute King. Thenceforth he devoted his life and wealth to the fortunes of his co-religionists, and won thereby, as he richly merited, both fame and wealth. A part of his inheritance was a claim against the Crown for sixteen thousand pounds. It was regarded as the poorest of assets, but Penn was willing to take his pay in that which cost the King nothing but his signature. In quittance of his claim he secured Pennsylvania. Both parties were well pleased, the King to have his cancelled bond, and Penn to have a new land for his people. In 1681 Penn brought his large and well-equipped colony up the Delaware, passed Salem, where their friends had preceded them, and began the settlement of Philadelphia. To his great good-fortune, he found his land occupied by Indians of a spirit similar to that of his own people. The Delawares had been harried and beaten by their fierce northern neighbors, the Iroquois, till they were in no fighting mood. His own good-will and fair spirit gave them confidence, and led to that honorable treaty under the elm tree on the bank of Shackamaxon Creek. Penn's colony was spared the chapter of privation and want which all the others had passed through. It was strong from the start, and recruits came every month. The "New Light" had been spreading rapidly. There were fifty thousand Quakers in England alone.[1] In Wales their meetings were springing up on every hand.

Penn's colony.

1 Rowntree: Quakerism, Past and Present, p. 72.

In Germany a multitude of kindred spirits had learned to know Penn.[1] From all these sources immigrants came pouring in.

It was meant to be for all time a Quaker State, but the names of its founders are now to be looked for upon the Communicants' lists of the Church. The descendants of Penn and Jennings and Shippen, of the Welsh Evans and Roberts, are now Episcopalians. The sect ceased long ago to be a power in America. It never made any converts in this country. When it had received the last of the immigrants who had become Quakers over the sea, its growth ceased, and long before that time it had begun to lose. The reason why is plain. Its fundamental tenet was false. This central error had become incased in a setting of customs and forms which has survived with great tenacity, but has had no power of propagation.

Quakers coming to the Church.

Why those who freed themselves from Quakerism should, as a rule, have come into the Church, is not at first sight so plain. It has not been the forms or the doctrines of the Church which has drawn them, but its spirit. The self-contained righteousness of life, the distrust of enthusiasm, the decency and propriety which have always been the Church's marks, have constituted the magnet. The Quaker, turned Churchman, has made a marked change outwardly, but it has not been accompanied by any wrench of the inner spirit. For this cause the gradual disintegration of that sect has been a constant source of gain to the Church. It began by a quarrel among

[1] Graham: Colonial History of United States, vol. i. p. 548.

the Quakers themselves. The Salem colony employed a Scotch Presbyterian, George Keith, a graduate of the University of Aberdeen, in the capacity of land-surveyor. It was his first acquaintance with the Friends. He became deeply interested in them and their peculiar doctrine and customs. Presently he saw the "Inner Light" himself, and became one of them. He was a valuable recruit. He was, to begin with, an educated man, and they had few such. He was, besides, a born controversialist and pamphleteer. He set their vague thoughts to words. He challenged their opponents to debate, and became their dexterous champion. His pamphlets and tracts were eagerly welcomed, not only by the Jersey Quakers, but by the more important society in Philadelphia. The Philadelphians invited him to come to them, as head master of their school. He quickly became their leading man, their David against the Philistines. But presently there began to be whisperings that their champion was not sound in the faith. He began to intimate that, while the "Inner Light" was necessary, it needed something besides itself. The "candle should have a candlestick;" "the spirit must needs have a body." This heresy struck at the root of Fox's simple system, and the Quaker instinct quickly discovered the fact. A period of controversy within the Society ensued. Keith had many friends and followers, and was far more than a match for his opponents in argument. Finally the "Yearly Meeting" passed a formal condemnation upon him. He issued a Vindication, for the publishing of which William Bradford, printer, was sent to jail by the Quakers in their

George Keith.

magisterial capacity. Keith accepted his expulsion, and set up a separate Meeting, where he drew a large following. An acrimonious controversy followed, which convulsed the settlement and arrayed friend against friend.[1] While it raged Keith went to England upon private business. While there he took occasion to re-examine the whole question in a broader spirit, and was led to the Church of England, in which he took orders. We shall presently see him return as her first missionary.

First Pennsylvania Church.

There was a provision in the terms of Penn's grant to the effect that if ever twenty people in the colony should petition therefor, they should have the right to organize a Church of England parish, and apply to the Bishop of London for a minister. In 1695 such a petition was circulated, signed, among others, by several hundred of the "Keithian Quakers." The Quakers raged furiously against it — (if Quakers can rage furiously), — and the magistrates had the attorney who drew up the petition arrested, together with several of the signers. Their action was, however, so evidently without law, that nothing beyond annoyance and ill-will came of it. By this time the Quakers had been so overslaughed by other immigration that, taking the whole colony together, they constituted less than one-third the population. Among these others the majority were nominally Church of England people. About this time services of the Church began to be held in Philadelphia. Neither the time nor the place

[1] The documents with which the parties assailed one another are, for the most part, preserved in William Bradford's Publications, in the Pennsylvania Historical Society's rooms, and are curious reading.

of the first Common-Prayer worship can now be known. The Rev. Mr. Sewell of Maryland is the first clergyman who comes in sight. He visited Philadelphia from time to time, and held occasional services for the Church folk. The original place of worship is described as "a wooden shed, with a bell swung in the crutch of a tree near by." By 1700 Christ Church had been organized, a brick church costing six hundred pounds had been built, and the Rev. Thomas Clayton, the first incumbent, had taken charge. The town was still strongly under the domination of Quakerism, but the Keithians were ready to come into the Church. In the first few years of the parish more than five hundred of them were baptized. The growth was more rapid, however, in the outlying settlements than it was at the centre. Especially did it gain ground among the Welsh, whose seat was west of the Schuylkill. In 1700 there were missions planted at Radnor, Concord, Chester, and Perkiomen. These became the nuclei for the scattered Church families in the back settlements, and the Church grew apace in Penn's colony.

Increase and spread.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CAROLINAS.

The first church in South Carolina was built the same year that Penn's colony landed on the Delaware. The life of that colony had been feeble and turbulent. The Gentleman's Magazine for 1740 gives a curious but apocryphal account of the planting of the Church among the palmettos. The story is, that on Good Friday, 1660, two ships laden with English adventurers landed at Port Royal. The company piled their goods on the beach, and the ships which had brought them sailed away home. The adventurers, ignorant alike of woodcraft and husbandry, when a few months had passed, found themselves starving. They were fortunate in having a brave chaplain, Morgan Jones, a Welshman. In their extremity he offered, with a few others, to make the perilous journey in search of Raleigh's colony on the Roanoke, — of whose destruction they were ignorant, — to gain succor for the rest. After many days' journey the little band were taken prisoners by the Tuscaroras. They were bound to the stake, and the savages stood about impatient to begin the torture. In his dire extremity Jones returned unconsciously to his mother tongue, and muttered his prayers in Welsh. To his amazement, he found that "the salvages did right well understand

Indians and Welsh.

his speech." The captives' bonds were cut and they were respited from immediate torture, but detained as captives. Jones continued to teach the Indians in Welsh, and so gained their good-will that he and his companions were set free, and by some means found their way north. In 1680 this same Morgan Jones was officiating at Newtown, L.I.[1]

The real settlement of the Carolinas was not until 1670. A company had been formed which included the Lord Chancellor, Shaftesbury, Albemarle, Berkeley, Ashley, and Carteret. The colony which they sent out settled at "Charles's town." This was a "Crown Colony," and had no religious motive. It was purely commercial. Of course, as being an integral part of the kingdom, the Church was, in a certain vague way, established. But in the fierce struggle with nature, which is the first task of a colony, religious differences are not much emphasized, unless the company settling should have been moved by religious motives in their migration. The character of the founders of this colony was not such as to lead them to take much interest in such questions. A few men of noble birth, though questionable manners, were among them, but the majority were adventurers and broken men. By the time the colony had reached a population of five thousand, the Bishop of London sent his Commissary to organize the Church. He reports: "I never repented of anything, my sins excepted, as my

The "noble" colony.

[1] This curious belief in the identity of the Welsh and Indian tongues crops up repeatedly in the accounts of the early settlements, and at points most remote from each other.

coming to this place. The people here are the vilest race of men upon the earth. They have neither honor, honesty, nor religion, — being a perfect hotch-potch made up of bankrupt pirates, decayed libertines, sectaries, and enthusiasts of all sorts, who have transported themselves here from Bermudas, Jamaica, Barbadoes, New England, and Pennsylvania, and are the most factious and seditious people in the whole world. Many of those who pretend to be Churchmen are strangely crippled in their goings between the Church and Presbytery, and, as they are of large and loose principles, so they live and act accordingly, sometimes going openly with the Dissenters, as they do now against the Church, and giving incredible trouble to the government and clergy."

Religious condition of the colony.

In the inevitable quarrel between the people and the proprietaries, the Church of England in South Carolina sided against the people, and the Presbyterians with them. This will account for "their crippled goings between the Church and Presbytery." The Church gained ground slowly, if at all. At the outbreak of the Revolution, nearly a century later, there was only the one parish which had been organized in 1682. It was not until well along in the nineteenth century that substantial growth began.[1] At the opening of the eighteenth century there was in Charleston "a large and stately church of cypress logs, on a brick foundation, surrounded by white palisades," and named St. Philip's. An act of the Colonial Assembly of 1698 named Samuel Marshall its incumbent; ap-

The establishment.

[1] Graham: Colonial History of U.S., vol. i. p. 339.

propriated to him and his successors forever a salary of one hundred and fifty pounds per annum, to be raised by assessment; and ordered that "a negro man and woman and four cows and calves be purchased at the public charge, for his use."

CHAPTER VIII.

A GENERAL SURVEY.

We have now seen the stage set and the actors appear. With the single exception of Georgia the colonies are now all established. We have seen who their settlers are, whence they came, why they came, and how they bore themselves religiously in the early days. We have brought English Churchmen to the James, English Puritans to Massachusetts Bay, Dutch Presbyterians to the Hudson, English Romanists to the Potomac, Swedish Churchmen and English Quakers to the Delaware, and a congeries of English-speaking adventurers, under noble patronage, to the Carolinas. We have seen the diverse problems presented to the Church of England in the presence of peoples so unlike. In one place, its task was to retain its original establishment; in another, to gain a foothold in the midst of a hostile community; in another, to march with an equal step among its rivals in a free field. The end of the first century of its life in America will be a fitting place to pause and take a broad survey of its situation, to count its gains and losses, to observe its manner of life, to examine the people among whom it is to do its work in the years to follow, to test its spirit and its methods.

The great bulk of the Church in 1700 was in Virginia and Maryland. Forty of the less than threescore clergy scattered from Portsmouth to Charleston were in these two colonies. There were in them two or three comfortable churches, built of imported brick. In every settlement was a church of logs, with puncheon floors and clapboard roof. The population was purely agricultural and widely scattered. To these little log chapels the people came, on horseback and in canoes, from twenty, thirty, and forty miles away.[1] They often left their distant plantations on the Saturday and spent the night with their hospitable friends who lived nearer the place of worship. Never more than one service was held on the Sunday. The afternoon was needed for the congregation to return to their far-away homes. Prayer-Books were scarce and costly.[2] As late as the middle of the century only two editions had been printed in England beside the ponderous folios and quartos for the reading-desks. Of the smaller Prayer-Books very few found their way to the colonies, and were but ill adapted to the worshippers' use, at best. The arrangement of the services in them was so intricate as hardly to be intelligible. The *Clerk*, therefore, was depended upon for all the responses, except in the portions of the service which the people knew by heart. The surplice was very rarely used. Indeed, it is doubtful if there were then more than two or three in America.

The year 1700.

Prayer-Books.

In England the ordinary street dress of the clergy

[1] King's Handbook of Episcopal Churches, p. 13.
[2] Perry: History, vol. i. p. 475.

was the cassock.[1] In America this dress does not seem ever to have come into use. In public the minister officiated in the ordinary dress of a gentleman of corresponding standing. His social standing was very low indeed, independent of his personal character. Macaulay's highly colored picture of the English clergy of that time was fairly true of the Southern colonies. "A Levite," such was the phrase then in use, "might be had for his board and ten pounds a year; might not only perform his own professional functions, be the most patient of butts and listeners, be always ready in fine weather for bowls and in foul for shovel-board, but might also save the expense of a gardener or a groom. Sometimes the reverend man nailed up the apricots; sometimes he curried the coach-horses. He was permitted to dine with the family, but was expected to content himself with the plainest fare. He might fill himself with the corned beef and carrots, but when the tarts and cheesecakes appeared he quitted the board and stood aloof till he was summoned to return thanks for the repast, from a great part of which he had been excluded. The attorney and the apothecary looked down with disdain upon the clergyman, and one of the lessons most earnestly inculcated on every girl of honorable family was to give no encouragement to a lover in Orders." Queen Elizabeth in her time, as head of the Church, had issued a special command that no clergyman should presume to espouse a servant-girl without the consent of her master or mistress. His children were brought up like the children of the peas-

Social status of the clergy.

[1] Personal Recollections of Gilbert Scott, p. 28.

antry. His boys followed the plough, and his daughters went out to service. Parson Sampson not only taught George and Harry Esmond their letters, but acted as overseer of their mother's negroes. A large proportion of the Southern clergy were adventurers, broken men, valets who had secured ordination from some complaisant Bishop through the interest of their masters for whom they had done some questionable favor. A constant complaint was, also, that they were Scotchmen. Their letters of Orders were often suspicious,[1] and their characters still more so. Commissaries Blair of Virginia and Bray of Maryland repeatedly reported to the Bishop of London that the meagre support of the clergy and the slight honor in which they were held prevented them from making honorable marriages and led them into disgraceful connections. A love-letter still survives written by a Maryland clergyman to a planter's daughter, in which he argues at length that inasmuch as his suit was allowable on other grounds, the fact of his being in Orders ought not to be an insuperable barrier.[2] They provoked contempt and allowed themselves to be treated like lackeys. Governor Nicholson led out one who was drunk in the church, and caned him soundly with his own hand; clapped the hat over the eyes of another; and sent *billets-doux* to his mistress by a third.[3] He hectored and browbeat a whole Convocation and drove them to sign an adulatory testi-

[1] The Episcopal Church was suppressed in Scotland; Scotch Orders doubted, and afterward declared null and void by England. Abbey: English Church and its Bishops in the Eighteenth Century, vol. ii. p. 179, *et seq.*

[2] Lodge: History of English Colonies in America, p. 90.

[3] Ibid., p. 61.

monial to his own religious devoutness. Commissary Blair writes: "The governor rules us as if we were a company of galley slaves, by continual raving and thundering, cursing and swearing, base, abusive, Billingsgate language, to that degree that it is utterly incredible." [1] One commissary was given the lie in his own house by the governor; [2] and the wife of another was pulled out of Lady Berkeley's pew by the wrist because her husband had offended its owner by "preaching a little too home against adultery." [3]. There were always present in these colonies some clergy of exemplary life and high character, but neither their example nor their reproofs were able to redeem their brethren. Most of them were planters, and did priestly duty now and then to eke out their income. They hunted, played cards, drank punch and canary, turned marriages, christenings, and funerals alike into revels. One bawled out to his church-warden at the Holy Communion, "Here, George, this bread is not fit for a dog." One fought a duel in his graveyard. Another, a powerful fellow, thrashed his vestrymen one by one, and the following Sunday preached before them from the text, "And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair." [4] Another dined every Sunday with his chief parishioner, and was sent home in the evening drunk, tied in his chaise.[5]

Clerical manners.

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Virginia, pp. 125, 491.
[2] Ib. p. 491.
[3] Ib. p. 27.
[4] Neh. xiii. 29.
[5] Cf. Meade: Old Churches and Families of Virginia, pp. 18, 162, 231, 250, 275.

In the Northern colonies both the character and the standing of the clergy were very much higher. In these colonies there had never been anything to attract unworthy men. The duty was hard and ill paid, and only men who had high motives undertook it. In the South the disreputable priest might gain fortune as a tobacco-planter. In the North the conditions of life were harder. There also he was surrounded by a people whose religious life, at least in the early part of the century, was exacting. There was no establishment to sustain him. But, above all, the Puritan conception of the ministerial office had early made itself felt. While the priest in Virginia was content to be a lackey, the Puritan minister in Massachusetts was a petty potentate, the chiefest man in the community, the censor of morals, the stern disciplinarian. In the Church the office was generally looked upon as a profession. Outside it was regarded as a spiritual calling. In England the position and accomplishments of the "superior clergy" were sufficient to keep for the office generally a certain respect. But the mass of the clergy were then held in anything but honor. A debt which the Church owes to Puritanism on both sides of the water is the restored reputation of the ministry. The popular mind never distinguishes closely between things which look alike. To it a clergyman is a clergyman, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian hands have been laid upon him. The ministry with which people were most familiar in the colonies was irregular in its commission, but held in high honor by those among whom it was exercised. For this reason the

Effect of Puritanism upon clerical office.

ministry of the Church, beginning with New England in the seventeenth century, and extending all over the country in the eighteenth, came to share that place in public esteem which has ever since been cheerfully accorded to the sacred office.

In Maryland and Virginia the Church of England was established by law. It had privileges and immunities granted to no sect. Marriages could only be celebrated by its clergy. The glebes and perquisites were guaranteed to its use. Its services and clergy were supported by taxes to be laid and collected by process of law. Their brethren at the North envied their position, and looked to the time when they should be similarly blessed, but the event proved that what was deemed their strength was really their weakness.

Conflict with vestries.

In Virginia the right of *presentation* lay in the royal governor, as representing the Bishop of London, but the power of *induction* to the benefice was with the vestry. Being once inducted, however, the vestry's power over the incumbent was exhausted. They could not remove him from his benefice, and they could not starve him out, for his income was assured by law. From this arose that contest between the clergy and the vestries, which finally tore the Church to pieces. The vestries in many instances refused to induct whom the governor had nominated. There was no power able to issue a *mandamus*. The result was that clergymen were hired by them from year to year, and made to dance attendance upon their pleasure. The position was an ignoble one, and had attractions only for unworthy men. Presently, as the

vestries came more and more under the American idea, and the clergy more and more emphatic in their loyalty to the English Church and Crown, the breach widened. By the middle of the century we will find it to be incurable. Sound Church notions of the relation of priest and people were completely thrown back and obscured by the political situation. When the clergy were only standing out for the inherent rights of their Order, they were placed in a position where they seemed to be the champions of a foreign political power. The union of English Church and State here, as always, worked to the Church's ruin. The true Church idea was almost entirely lost to sight by both sides. The same law, for example, which "established" the Church in South Carolina, provided for a board of laymen who could try and remove any minister against whom complaint should be made by a majority of the vestry, together with nine aggrieved parishioners.[1] The laity of the middle colonies were of much the same mind, but without the legal power to make it effective; but the difference between the two orders was, in kind, the same as in the South. A meeting of the clergy of New York and Pennsylvania formally resolved thenceforward to do without vestries altogether, but the vestries held their own, and have ever since been an effective part of the Church's machinery.

In New York and Massachusetts the Church had also a legal recognition at this date, which seemed to place it at an advantage. In so far as the colonies were under the English law, after the revocation of the original

1 Perry: History, vol. i. p. 376.

charters, the Episcopal Church was that one which the law knew here. The Church, in a certain sense, went with the flag. But the question of how far English law was modified or suspended by the new charters and by colonial legislation, was a mooted one.[1] Its manner of settlement, so far as the Church was concerned, inclined to either hand in proportion as the population was friendly to her or otherwise. Where it was unfriendly, every claim of prerogative by her produced irritation and opposition. In New England this was frequently the case. For many years the Church had not been allowed at all. When it came in with the new governor on the Rose frigate, it at once attached to itself all the obloquy which the new *régime* created. Its royal backing saved it alive, but guaranteed for it the ill-will of the community. Nevertheless, by 1700 the "King's Chapel" had been built in Boston, its minister settled, and a considerable congregation gathered. But it was an exotic in a foreign climate, a garrison surrounded by a hostile people.

Effect of government support.

To the eastward of Massachusetts there was but a single congregation. Gorges's ever faithful settlement on the Kennebec had, through all the years, held steadfastly to their Church and Prayer-Book. For this they had been beset and harried by the Massachusetts Puritans; had been kept out of the New England League, and left single-handed to defend themselves against the common savage enemy; their commerce had been destroyed, their minister stripped of property and almost life, and now, an old man, incapable of duty and in poverty, he waited to die.

The Church in the East.

[1] Smith: History of New York. London, 1757, pp. 220–228.

To the westward there were a few Church families at the mouth of the Housatonic, and practically no more till New York was reached. In that town, with a population of about five thousand, Trinity Church had been built and endowed with a farm in the outskirts, had a minister and a claim to support by taxation. Accessions by immigration and by additions from the Dutch Presbyterians were numerous. The people were, upon the whole, not ill-disposed toward the Church. The whole province was, as we have seen, divided into parishes, and provision made for the support of the minister; but outside the capital there were no clergy, and, with the exception of a little group in the eastern part of Long Island, no Church people.

In the middle colonies.

In Pennsylvania, Christ Church had been built at Philadelphia, and under its faithful rector, Evan Evans, was rapidly gaining ground, both in the city from the Quakers, and from the Welsh in the outlying settlements.

In a word, at the opening of the eighteenth century, the Church may be said to have been planted in all the colonies. In some places, as we will see, it brought forth much fruit. In others it was choked, and required replanting.

CHAPTER IX.

THE "VENERABLE SOCIETY."

THE Church is now lodged in the colonies, not as an organization, but in the shape of isolated congregations, widely separated, a minority in the population, linked to each other only through the Bishop of London, who had a shadowy power of superintendency over them all.

In the period which lies between the year 1700 and the War of Independence, the history groups itself about a half-dozen topics. These we will notice in their order. The first is the work of the "*Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts.*"

In the closing years of the seventeenth century, the Rev. Dr. Bray was the successful rector of a parish in Warwickshire. He comes in sight as the first of the "working clergy." His spirit is distinctly modern. His methods strangely anticipated those of to-day. He was a "parish priest." He made himself familiar with the needs of his flock, and was fertile in devising plans for their benefit. Presently, he attracted the notice of his superiors, and was promoted. In his new office, he was oppressed with what he saw of the ignorance and general lack of equipment of the parish clergy. They could not feed their flocks, for they themselves were starving for lack of knowledge. Those among them who were best furnished with books

Dr. Bray.

had upon their shelves only the "Pearl of Eloquence, some German system, a few stitched sermons, with an old Geneva Bible and Concordance." Bray became their benefactor. He was one of those enthusiasts whose spirit is contagious. He interested his Bishop and other men and women of wealth and liberality, in the formation of a "Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge." Its first purpose was to found parish libraries for the benefit of the clergy and then of the people. By his efforts that society which now commands the pens of university examiners and tutors, and even of prime ministers, was set upon a strong foundation. In addition to its work at home it took up the added task to provide libraries for the churches in the colonies. Before Bray's death he saw more than forty such furnished to America alone.

In 1695, he was asked by Compton, Bishop of London, to visit and report upon the condition of the Church in the American Colonies. Compton's succession to the See of London was the best thing that had yet happened for the colonial churches. His sense of official responsibility for them was great. His predecessors had looked after their affairs a little, when it was convenient, but had not regarded themselves as legally responsible. Indeed, their shadowy jurisdiction was only the result of the accident that the then Bishop of London had been a member of the original "Virginia Company." At Compton's instance, the Bishop of London was formally put in charge of the colonies by an order in council.[1] Regarding them then as a

[1] Abbey: The English Church and its Bishops in the Eighteenth Century, vol. i. p. 82.

part of his diocese, he sent Dr. Bray to investigate their situation. After an extended visit of five years, he returned and published his "Memorial upon the State of Religion in America." He reports[1] that in South Carolina the Church was thriving, but at least three more clergy were needed. In North Carolina there were two Church settlements, a hundred miles apart, and no clergyman in either of them. In Maryland the endowment was, as yet, very insufficient, but the people had built churches for themselves. The Pennsylvanians had one Church of England Minister, well esteemed, and wished for more. The Jerseys had as yet none, but he thought there would be reception for six. New York had one; there was room for at least two more. In Long Island there were nine churches (parishes), but no ministers. In Rhode Island the Quaker neglect for outward teaching had caused great irreligion. There was a church there, and room for at least two ministers. New England was under Independents.

Dr. Bray's "Memorial."

But Dr. Bray was not content with merely making his report. He had left his heart in America. He laid the case of the Church there before everybody whom he could reach. He printed pamphlets, wrote letters, conferred with the Bishops, appealed to Parliament, and engaged the warm interest of the Queen. Through his tireless exertion there was organized in 1701 the first Missionary Society of the Protestant world. Its title was "The Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts." Its charter ran:

The S. P. G.

[1] Abbey: i. p. 84.

"William the Third, King of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, Greeting:

"Whereas we are informed that in many of our plantations and colonies beyond the sea, belonging to our Kingdom of England, the provision for ministers is very mean, whereby there is a great lack of the administration of the Word and Sacraments, causing atheism to abound for the want of learned and orthodox ministers, and Romish priests and Jesuits are encouraged to proselyte, . . . we therefore empower these, our right trusty subjects;" — then follow a hundred of the noblest names in England, with the Archbishop of Canterbury at the head, constituting the society. Its popularity was great from the outset. One member gave a thousand pounds for the work, another nine hundred for teaching the negroes. One gave to it his estate in the Barbadoes to found a college, and another a present of books and maps. Archbishop Tenison left it one thousand pounds towards founding two American bishoprics. The proprietors of Vermont set apart townships for its use. Evelyn enters in his diary that he had promised twenty pounds a year to it.[1] The society's actions were marked by good sense, good spirit, and broad-minded charity. Its first act was to circulate an "Address" to all bishops and archdeacons,[2] asking them to choose out fit persons for missionaries to the colonies and the Indians. The qualifications to be carefully noted in the persons recommended were: their age,

1 Caswall: American Church, p. 130.

2 "A collection of Papers printed by order of the S. P. G., London: printed by Joseph Downing in Bartholomew Close, near West Smithfield, 1712."

whether married or single, temper, prudence, learning, zeal, and loyalty to Church and Crown. The officials are solemnly adjured not to recommend any but fit men, and especially not to use the Society for the purpose of finding places for men whom they themselves wish to be rid of. "Standing Instructions" were issued to the applicants for appointment, that they shall not lodge at any public-house in London, but at some bookseller's or such private house; shall attend constantly the Standing Committee of the Society; that before embarking they shall wait upon his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury for his instructions; that when embarked they shall demean themselves so as to become remarkable examples of piety and virtue to the ship's company; that whether they be passengers or chaplains they shall endeavor to prevail with the captain to have morning and evening prayers, daily, with catechising on the Lord's Day; that during the passage they shall instruct, exhort, admonish, reprove, with seriousness and prudence, so as may gain them reputation and authority; that when they arrive in the country where they are sent they shall be frequent in private prayers, conversant with the Holy Scriptures, Prayer-Book, Articles, and Homilies; be circumspect; not board or lodge in public-houses; game not at all; converse not with lewd and profane persons, save to admonish them; be frugal; keep out of debt; not meddle with politics; keep away from quarrels; say the service every day, when practicable, and always with seriousness and decency; avoid high-flown sermons; preach against such vices as they

Instructions to missionaries.

may see to prevail; impress the nature and need of Sacraments; distribute the Society's tracts; visit their people, — in a word, bear themselves like Christians and gentlemen.

For salary they were to have fifty pounds a year, and ten pounds for outfit.

Among the many missionaries sent out by the Society, there were, of course, some who took to colonial work as a refuge from poverty or scandal,[1] but, as a rule, they made an impression at once by their high character and high Churchmanship. On this latter rock some of them split, but the general effect was to distinctly raise both the zeal and the tone of the Church in America.[2]

First missionaries of the S. P. G.

Their first missionaries were Keith, the whilom Philadelphia Quaker, and his friend Patrick Gordon. These came out in the ship Centurion, and on the voyage the ship's chaplain, John Talbot, determined to join them. Within a few weeks of their landing Gordon died at Jamaica, Long Island. Keith and Talbot, under the Society's instructions, made a tour of observation extending from Boston to Charleston. Though they were very pronounced Churchmen, more so than most of the clergy at that time on this side of the water, they followed loyally the Society's desire that they should adopt a conciliating tone with dissenters everywhere. They were to preach in their meeting-houses whenever opportunity might offer, not to offend their prejudices unnecessarily, and where possible, win them back to the Church. There is every

[1] Anderson: English Church in the Colonies, vol. iii. p. 149.
[2] Abbey: English Church and Bishops, vol. i. p. 91.

evidence of a widely spread inclination on the part of dissenters in America in the first half of the eighteenth century to return to the Church of England if the way could be made easy for them. It showed itself, as we will see later on (in connection with the story of the Episcopate), among Quakers, Lutherans, and Dutch, especially. The managers of the S. P. G. were men "having understanding of the times what things Israel ought to do." There is good reason to believe that if the Church had been here on the ground with a complete organization, the wise and conciliatory efforts of the Society's missionaries would have succeeded in healing at least some of those breaches in Zion, which have grown wider as the years have gone by.

Conciliating dissenters.

Talbot writes from Philadelphia, September 1, 1703: "We have gathered together several hundreds for the Church of England, and, what is more, to build churches for her. There are four or five now going forward in this province and the next. That at Burlington is almost finished. Churches are going up amain where there were none before. They are going to build three at Carolina, and three more in these lower counties about New Castle, beside those at Chester and Amboy." The advent of the Society's missionaries gave an impulse to the Church's growth all along the line. But she lengthened her cords faster than she was able to strengthen her stakes. A considerable number of the newly built churches were never occupied at all, or at best for a short while, by the people for whom they had been erected. Clergy could not

Building churches.

be had in sufficient numbers to man them. The missionaries went upon their way to the southward, and the enthusiasm lagged. The new churches became "stables for the Quakers' horses when they came to meeting or market." [1] A circumference of enthusiasm followed Keith and Talbot where they journeyed, but for the most part subsided when they had passed on. In Philadelphia and its vicinity hundreds of Quakers were baptized by them, and in the southern counties they were welcomed in the Independents' meeting-houses, where they preached, and commended the Church to all who heard them. After a visit of two years Keith returned to England, and Talbot settled down as permanent incumbent at Burlington, N. J., where he spent a long and honored life.[2] From this time until the War of Independence the history of the Church in America is to be looked for in the records of the Venerable Society. More and more missionaries were sent out by it, and it undertook, in part at least, the support of the native ministry which gradually grew up. The letters of these missionaries to the secretary, written from the seaboard cities, the backwoods

[1] Anderson: iii. p. 238.

[2] It has been positively asserted that Talbot, when an old man, upon a visit to England, was consecrated to the Episcopate by the English nonjuring Bishops. Anderson, Hawks, Wilberforce, and Caswall all say so, apparently all following the same original authority, whatever that may be. The Rev. Dr. Hills, in his "History of the Church in Burlington," discusses the subject exhaustively, and maintains the same assertion. In vol. i. of Bishop Perry's "History of the American Episcopal Church" is a Monograph by Rev. Dr. John Fulton in which he re-examines the whole case, and arrives at the conclusion, which seems without doubt to be the truth, that Talbot never received such consecration; and that the tradition itself arose from confounding his name with that of another man.

settlements, the inland villages, the Indian encampments, and preserved in the Society's archives, constitute a vivid picture of the Church's life for seventy years.[1]

[1] Bishop Perry has, with infinite pains, collected and published in fine folio volumes the Society's documents relating to the Colonial Church, under the title of "Historical Collections."

CHAPTER X.

THE COMMISSARIES: MARYLAND.

At the same time that the Venerable Society sent out its first missionaries, the Bishop of London commissioned Dr. Bray, the promoter of the Society, to represent him in Maryland. He was empowered to assume the reins of the Church in the colony, to exercise discipline, to reform manners, to settle disputes, to preserve order, to build up the Church. His salary was fixed at four hundred pounds a year, — a liberal sum for the times, — all of which, together with his own patrimony, he expended on his work.

Dr. Bray in Maryland.

Upon his arrival in Lord Baltimore's former Roman Catholic province, he found that the Church of England contained, at least nominally, about eighty per cent of the population. The other twenty per cent embraced the insignificant remnant of Romanists, together with Baptists, Quakers, Huguenots, and German Lutherans from the Palatinate. There was a larger proportion of people ecclesiastically unattached than in any other colony save South Carolina. The decadence of Romanism, the negations of Quakerism, and the long lack of organization in the Church, had all conspired to multiply this class. Still, the Church of England was the dominating religious influence. The Commissary at first mistook the temper of the people.

Fresh from the Establishment at home, he undertook to introduce the same *régime* here. The disorders in doctrine and worship were evident. The way to cure them, as it seemed to him, was to secure by force of law the same uniformity in worship and discipline here which the State Church guaranteed in England. He found in Governor Nicholson a man who was of the same mind, ecclesiastically, with himself. He and the Governor persuaded the Provincial Assembly, apparently without difficulty, to pass an "Act of Uniformity," substantially the same as that which had obtained in England before the "Act of Toleration" made it tolerable. It provided not only that the Book of Common Prayer should be used in all the parishes of the Establishment, but also that it was "to be solemnly read by all and every minister or reader in every church or other place of public worship within this province."[1] A storm of opposition at once arose. The dissenters asked indignantly whether or not they were to be accounted as Englishmen; whether they were to be denied here in America that privilege of worshipping after their own fashion which had been allowed to their brethren in England for a generation. It was too late to protest against the Act in the colony, but their agents carried their grievances to the Crown, and, chiefly through the influence of the Quakers, succeeded in having the obnoxious clause vetoed in Privy Council.

Maryland establishment.

But the attempt to pass it had been a grave mistake. It failed, to be sure, but it gave the dissenters cause to distrust the Church's spirit. She seemed to them to be

[1] Hawks: Contributions, vol. ii. p. 98. Perry: History, vol. i. p. 143.

moved by a temper of gratuitous intolerance. It was all the more offensive because it was impotent. From being only indifferent to her, they passed into bitter enemies. The time came when they could make their enmity felt. But the law, as it still stood, put the Churchmen in possession.[1] Every minister presented by the governor, appointed, and inducted, received the "forty per poll," out of which he was to pay the clerk a fixed sum. Justices and magistrates were forbidden to perform the marriage ceremony, which was made the *peculium* of the Church of England clergy, at a fixed fee of "five shillings sterling and no more." The sheriff of the county was bound to collect the tobacco-tax for the minister. The incumbent was made *ex officio* a member of the vestry. The members of the vestries were bound to attend meetings under penalty. The care and repair of churches was provided for by a special tax, not to exceed ten pounds of tobacco for any one year. The dissenters were to be allowed to conduct worship as they saw fit, *provided* their places of meeting were certified to and registered at the county court.

Having secured the legal status of the Church, the Commissary set about investigating the condition of the clergy and parishes. A Convocation, attended by fourteen of the clergy summoned, gave him the opportunity to address them with wisdom and earnestness upon their official conduct. A prolonged visitation which he undertook gave him the chance to see their manner of life. He found among them some devout and earnest men, but a still larger

Attempt to reform manners.

[1] Perry: History, vol. i. p. 143.

number who had fallen into the easy manners of the time and place, whose professional duties sat lightly upon them, and some whose lives were a scandal, and whose duties were utterly neglected. He began by proceeding against one or two flagrant offenders against morals and decency. He found the task of reform far more difficult than he had anticipated. He had but small real power over the clergy. The Church being "established," the Missionary Society in England assumed that it was able to look after itself, and declined to take any of the clergy upon its pay-rolls. That sharpest kind of discipline, cutting off the offender's salary, was therefore not available. Beside that, the clergy held their incumbency by the appointment of the Governor, and he was always jealous of any interference with his prerogatives. Moreover, the easy-going habits of the clergy suited the people very well. They were at heart somewhat afraid of the new type of minister which Dr. Bray held up as the model.[1] Believing that he could better serve the interest of his province from London than by remaining in it, he went home, and never again returned. For a while he continued to hold his office, but soon resigned it, joining in the request of the clergy of the colony, that another Commissary might be sent out; but until his death in 1734 he never flagged in his zeal. He pressed upon the authorities, without ceasing, the necessity of a resident bishop. He kept the Church at home informed concerning Maryland, collected money for it, and secured recruits for its ministry.

[1] Hawks: Ecclesiastical Contributions, New York, 1839, vol. ii. p. 213.

But in the colony the inevitable conflict between the clergy and the people began to develop itself. The resuscitation of Church life brought it out. While the clergy were apathetic, especially while they refrained from magnifying their office, it lay latent. But the toning up of the priestly standard, and above all the emphasis put upon the legal establishment, brought out to view the inherent conflict of interest. The history of the Church here, as in Virginia, is simply the story of the long controversy between the clergy, and the people represented by the legislature. Sometimes the Governor took one side and sometimes the other, and sometimes the contest was triangular. In this situation healthy Church life was impossible. Discipline could not be maintained. The confusion of rights and powers was hopeless. "Thus the proprietor selected a clergyman in England; the Bishop of London gave him a license; the Governor inducted him; if he did wrong the Commissary tried him (if there happened to be a Commissary); and, when convicted, *no power punished him;* for, after induction, even the proprietor could not remove him, and the Bishop of London could neither give nor take away the meanest living in the province." [1] Nor were the laws any more able to protect good clergy in their rights than to punish bad ones for their faults. When a new Commissary, Mr. Henderson, landed in 1730, he barely escaped being mobbed.[2] A chivalric layman struck him in the face, and the blow was meekly borne; he struck him a second time, and received such a drubbing from the reverend

The irrepressible conflict.

[1] Hawks: Ecclesiastical Contributions, vol. ii. p. 190.
[2] Ib.: vol. ii. p. 204.

man's hands as taught him never to do the like again.[1] Another clergyman took to task a layman who had slandered the cloth generally, and for doing so was challenged to fight a duel. When he declined he was set upon by the layman and beaten within an inch of his life.[2] The breach between clergy and people grew wider yearly. The Romanists and Presbyterians looked on with unconcealed glee. The Church's extremity was their opportunity, which they did not fail to embrace. The Churchmen saw that the only hope of salvation for the distracted Church lay in securing a resident bishop who could assume the reins, and bring order out of the confusion. They represented the case so strongly to the authorities of the mother Church, that for the first time, after a century of effort, consent was secured. Gibson, Bishop of London, asked the clergy to select a fit man, send him to England, and he would consecrate him his suffragan for Maryland.[3] Whether the Bishop had secured the royal warrant for his proposed action is somewhat doubtful. But in any case it was not put to the test. For when the Maryland clergy chose Colebatch, one of their number, in obedience to his mandate, the Colonial Legislature issued a writ *ne exeat* and forbade him to leave the province.

Legislation hostile to the Church.

The local legislature could not disestablish the Church, but, by a series of sinister acts, they made the Establishment worse than useless. Little by little the Church ceased to lean upon it, but unfortunately was not able to disentangle itself so as to stand upon a purely religious footing.

[1] Hawks: vol. ii. p. 205. [2] Ib. p. 206. [3] Ib. p. 196.

Here again, as everywhere, they who took the sword perished by the sword. "Had affairs," says Dr. Hawks, "been permitted to proceed to their natural termination without that interruption caused by the American Revolution, the time would have come when the singular spectacle would have been seen of the extinction of a church established by law, while no man could have found in the legislation of the country a statute depriving it of its character as an establishment. The law that gave it preference would have still stood unrepealed among the early acts of the province; while the history of its downfall might be traced in the side blows of an indirect legislation." [1] Under the circumstances Romanism took a fresh start; the Presbyterians flocked in from Pennsylvania and Delaware, and from Ulster direct; and the Church of England gradually but surely lost ground and lost character. At the close of the period before us, while devout and godly men like Bray, Henderson, Boucher, and many others had given themselves to her service, still the Church had fallen far behind in the march of population; had many unworthy men serving at her altars; had gained the enduring hostility of dissenters; lost the love of her own children, and waited for the political catastrophe out of whose ruins she was to emerge to a new and better life.

[1] Hawks: vol. ii. p. 247.

CHAPTER XI.

THE COMMISSARIES: VIRGINIA.

The Virginia Commissary.

During all the time that Dr. Bray was the Bishop of London's representative for Maryland, Dr. Blair held the same office in Virginia. His was by far the largest and most important service of all the Commissaries. Beginning the duties of his office in 1685, he continued in it fifty-three years. He was a Scotchman, in Scotch orders, and with a Scotch temper; shrewd, far-sighted, cautious, and masterful. His Orders and his policy were more than once called in question, but they were both more than vindicated in the issue. When he first surveyed his field he found a population loyal to the Church and Crown. Virginia boasted herself as the "ever-faithful colony." Her people were pleased to say that "Charles II was King in Virginia before he was in England." The Puritan revolution which broke over the Church both at home and in the colonies left this one practically untouched. Her people lived on serenely, preserving their old fashions of life and worship, without much thought of the saints or their Commonwealth. They still called themselves the servants of the King, and when the Stuart line ended they transferred their loyalty to William and Mary. Neither nonjuror nor dissenter gained influence among them. Dr. Blair, upon

his arrival, found the most unmixed Episcopal community that has ever existed on this Continent. He found a considerable number of clergy still surviving whose standard of life and work was modelled upon that of the saintly Hunt and the apostolic Whittaker. But he found a still larger number who had fallen away from the heroic type of the early days, and had conformed themselves to the lower manner of life which had then fairly set in. The lack of education, among clergy and people both, struck the Commissary with a special horror. To correct this, he set about a plan which had been intermittently wrought upon almost from the first settlement of the colony. That was to establish and endow an institution of learning, which should be, first of all, a seminary for educating a ministry, and, in addition, a college, a school for the youth of the colonists, and a place where the children of the native Indians could be educated in civilization and Christianity. "To furnish a seminary of Ministers of the Gospel, educate youth in good manners, and propagate truth among the Indians in these parts," was the way the charter stated it. The establishment of William and Mary College is due chiefly to the tireless, patient, arduous labor of Dr. Blair, its first president. His expectation that the Church people would forward his plans with enthusiasm for so desirable a purpose was bitterly disappointed. He found them for the most part apathetic, and often hostile. Nowhere in the colonies were social distinctions so sharply drawn and so long-lived as in Virginia. The rich and cultured had already begun to

William and Mary College.

form a caste, and to draw away from the common people. The sympathies of the clergy were largely with the former. In some cases they were their friends and relatives; in still more, their humble retainers. The rich planters would have none of the new college. They did not need it for themselves, and did not want it for others. They sent their own sons home to be trained, like Madam Esmond's boys, at English schools and universities, and to learn the manners suited to their rank in life. If the sons of the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick-maker should get a smattering of polite learning, in a cheap way, out in the backwoods, the effect would only be to induce them to forget their place, and the proper distinctions among persons would be lost sight of. The general sentiment of the clergy corresponded. They were not conscious of special defect in themselves in point of learning, and could not see why the present condition of things should not continue. *Quieta non movere!*

Opposition to the college.

The official opinion in England was the same. It looked upon the colony as a "plantation," not as the beginning of a State. When the Attorney-General was asked to draw up a charter for the projected college, he declined to have anything to do with such a piece of folly. When the Commissary pressed the duty upon him, and urged that the colonists also had souls which demanded care, he broke out with, "Damn their souls! let them grow tobacco!" Dr. Blair persisted, however, in spite of clerical apathy, lay hostility, and official reluctance. He opened the subscription with one hundred and fifty pounds from his own meagre salary. He

secured twenty-five hundred pounds from the merchants of London, — the class of Englishmen who were always best informed concerning American affairs. Through the influence of Governor Nicholson a grant of twenty thousand acres of land was secured for an endowment. But when Sir Edmund Andros came into authority, every conceivable obstacle was placed in the Commissary's way. Not only was he personally slighted, but the power of his principal called in question. "Such of the clergy as are most refractory against [the Bishop of London's] authority are upon that account received into favor. It is a common maxim among [the Governor's] friends that we have nothing to do with the Bishop of London, nor no Church power."[1] The Governor gave nothing himself, and dissuaded his friends, not only from subscribing, but from paying what they had already subscribed.[2] Squatters were allowed to sit down upon the College grant, and the rightful owners were powerless either to have them put off or to have the land surveyed.[3]

The idea was diligently promoted that the setting up of the college meant the setting up of a new tax-rate for its maintenance. Many of the clergy were of the sort who were both unable and unwilling to further the really noble ends which the Commissary had in view; nor were his manners or methods always the best fitted to commend them. "Your clergy in these parts," writes an intelligent visitor to the Bishop of Lichfield, the King's almoner, "are of a very ill example. No disci-

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Va. p. 4.
[2] Ib. p. 18.
[3] Ib. p. 20.

pline or canons of the Church are observed. They are for the most part Scotchmen, people indeed so basely educated, and so little acquainted with the excellency of their charge and duty, that their lives and conversations are more fitted to make heathens than Christians."[1] He adds that what the people need above all things is a bishop; that if a right reverend father, of the stamp of Governor Nicholson of Maryland, should come, it "would make hell tremble;" that the people are much affronted because the Bishop of London has sent one Dr. Blair, a Scotchman, to represent him, whereas there might surely have been found an English clergyman to fill that office; and that Dr. Blair and the Governor were at loggerheads about the matter of the new college. But Dr. Blair persisted, and in 1700 building was begun at Williamsburg, from plans contributed by Sir Christopher Wren. Once the college was really in existence, and was found to be an institution in which the people might take pride, they turned toward it with much affection. It became at once, and continued for some time to be, a centre of influence for the Church. It was influential in raising the tone of both the clergy and the laity. It secured a better educated ministry. For a while it had some success in its plans for training the Indian youth. Seventy are reported as having been at one time under its teaching.

The college and the Church.

But the elevation of the ministerial profession, effected largely through the Commissary's educational and disciplinary measures, brought out here, as the

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Va. p. 30.

same causes did in Maryland, the latent conflict between the English Church and the American people. The clergy represented a foreign authority, of which the still loyal Virginians had already begun to feel jealous. As the jealousy deepened, the people and clergy began to grow apart. When Dr. Blair died the people declared they would never receive his successor. Discipline declined, and the clergy became at the same time looser in their living, and more strenuous in insisting upon the right of support which was theirs by virtue of the Establishment. For many years the dreary story drags on, — the vestries trying to reduce parish tax-rates by refusing to induct ministers into their livings, the clergy growing sharper in seizing their legal perquisites, and the honest priests and godly people grieving more and more at the deplorable state into which things had fallen. This last class never ceased their efforts to bring about better things. They addressed the Governor, represented the facts to the Bishop of London, petitioned the Assembly, but to little purpose. One of their best digested plans for improvement gives a strange picture of the Church life of the time. It is a "Proposition" submitted to the Assembly in 1724. It[1] sets forth "the bad constitution of this country," especially in the following particulars: —

Decline of discipline.

Attempt at reform.

(1) Many parishes are so small that they cannot defray the minister's maintenance.

(2) Those parishes that are able are tempted to keep no minister, for, being without him, they keep so much of the parish levy in their own pockets.

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, Virginia, p. 334.

(3) The livings of this country, "by reason of their meanness, encourage only the lowest sized divines to adventure among us, and by their equality of salary leave the diligent to fare equally with the negligent and blockish."

(4) The precarious tenure by which they hold their living, being liable to be ejected by the vestry without any cause assigned, either keeps the better sort of ministers away, or compels them soon to leave.

(5) The want of plantations and mansion-houses, and the extreme difficulty of finding boarding places, specially for married clergy.

(6) The abuses put upon them by the sheriff and tax collectors, who either pay their salaries in bad tobacco, or delay paying it till there is no market or freight for it.

(7) The want of some effective mode of discipline, which will be able to deal with the scandalous ministers.

To cure these evils, it proposes:

To consolidate two or three small livings into one decent one; that whenever a new settlement of a hundred tithables springs up within seven miles of a church, the vestry must build a chapel in it, to which chapel the incumbent must give a portion of his time; that the vestry be compelled to pay the amount of the minister's salary into the church fund, whether they "induct" him or not; to change the amount of salary from a fixed sum of sixteen thousand pounds of tobacco, to forty pounds per poll, so that the salary will vary with the population, and, consequently, with the importance of the parish; that the glebe shall always contain "enough land to employ five or six

hands, have on it a house with a brick chimney and glass windows, a shingled roof, have at least one clear story ten foot pitch with two rooms and a closet and kitchen;" that the glebe be stocked by the parish with four or five negroes under an overseer, and seven or eight milch cows; that the incumbent shall have the right to appoint the tax collector; that every minister who brings a license to the colony shall be examined by the Commissary and "certain of the learnedest ministers;" shall in their presence "display his talents by a set discourse against Popery, Quakerism, or any other prevailing heresy;" that any minister who shall be found guilty of fornication, adultery, blasphemy, ridiculing the Holy Scriptures, or practising against the Thirty-nine Articles, shall be suspended for three years; that for cursing, swearing, drunkenness, or fighting (except in self-defence), he shall be suspended for one year; that because drunkenness is one of the most common crimes, and, at the same time, one of the hardest to be proved, the following shall be taken as sufficient proof of the offence; "sitting an hour or longer in a company where they are a-drinking of healths, and taking his cups as they come round; striking, challenging, threatening to fight, or laying aside his garments for that purpose; staggering, reeling, vomiting, impertinent or obscene talking, — the proof of these to proceed until the judges are satisfied that the minister's behavior was unbecoming or failing of the gravity of a minister; *provided*, that inasmuch as many of the signs be fallible as proofs of drunkenness (for vomiting may happen to a sober person from weak-

ness of stomach, and reeling from a sudden disease causing giddiness of the head), two or three credible witnesses who were in the company (and not drunk themselves) shall declare upon oath that in their opinion drunkenness was the cause of these signs;" that to each several article of this proposition "the lawyers shall contrive such good binding clauses and penalties that the law will execute itself."

The heroic remedies proposed show how deep-seated and diffused the malady was. But it must not be supposed that the Church was dead or its clergy all scandalous. Godly and well-learned men were serving her altars, and from time to time new churches were being organized by the noble laymen of which Virginia was fruitful even during this period. "King Carter" built a church at his own expense in the Northern Neck.[1] A new church was built at Glocester, with pulpit "hung with costly lace and damask, and a fine picture of the Last Judgment" was set over the altar before which the Washingtons worshipped.[2] A dozen others in the colony date from the same period. Washington, Patrick Henry, Harry Lee, John Randolph of Roanoke, and others whose names afterward rang through two continents, were alive, working, scheming, planning, praying in the Church. A Welsh colony of Church of England people moved into Virginia and Southern Pennsylvania, and for a while maintained a vigorous and flourishing life, but were ultimately swept into the rising stream

Devoted men in the Church.

[1] Rev. Philip Slaughter in Perry's Hist. vol. i. p. 628.
[2] Ib. p. 627.

of Americanism, caught in the current of the revivalism which was then sweeping southward like a torrent, and, for the most part, carried away from the Church.

A root of bitterness had been planted from which sprung up a pestilent fruit. The next generation found but the ruins of their fathers' altars, their church walls crumbled and overgrown. An irreconcilable conflict of interests forced the clergy and people apart, and brought disaster upon the Church. The evil was inherent in the situation. The real question at issue was but dimly discerned by either party to it. It was the foredoomed struggle which became inevitable when the colonies were planted, and, sooner or later, was fought out in each one of them. The peculiar shape it assumed varied in the several commonwealths, but was in essence the same in all. In Virginia it was settled in its ecclesiastical form before it was opened in its civil shape. It came to an issue in the celebrated "Parsons' Cause."[1] The situation was as follows: The Church of England was established by law and supported by revenue from taxation. The political divisions known in the Northern colonies as townships were here parishes. The vestry was elected by the legally qualified voters. It was in their hands to "induct" to his living the minister nominated by the Governor representing the Bishop of London. Being once inducted, a salary of sixteen thousand pounds of tobacco was due him by law, to be collected

Growing spirit of Americanism.

The "Parsons' Cause."

[1] For the best account of this important event see Prof. Moses Coit Tyler: Life of Patrick Henry, p. 32, *et seq.*

[1] Anderson: vol. iii. p. 136.

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, Va. 490, *et seq.*

by the sheriff. Tobacco was a commodity which fluctuated in value from year to year. In the seasons when it was low in the market, the parson pocketed his loss and waited to recoup himself next year, when it might be high. The quantity of sixteen thousand pounds was nominated in the bond. In 1763, a series of years in which the tobacco had been very low was followed by a time of very high prices. The parson could put his tobacco on the market and make good what he had lost in the preceding years. But the laity were reluctant to hand over the weed. By withholding it they could fill their own purses, and at the same time squeeze out the clergy against whom their grudge had steadily risen. The only thing to hinder was the law. This they found a way to evade, or rather violate. The Assembly passed an act to pay the parsons' salaries in Virginia currency, at the rate of twopence halfpenny per pound for the tobacco. In effect, it confiscated their tobacco and compelled them to take for it a price less than one-fourth of that which it would have brought in the market. But the Assembly knew that they were acting *ultra vires* in passing such a law. It was null and void, without the indorsement of the Crown. This, they knew, it never would receive. They therefore made it operative for a period of ten months from the time it was enacted. This, as they estimated, would cover the time required to take an appeal across the water and return, and in the mean while, for that year, at least, their purpose would have been gained. The clergy asked to be heard in opposition to the act, and were refused. They therefore drew together for consul-

tation as to the ruin which threatened them. They chose a committee of their number who proceeded to England to protest before the Privy Council. The Crown lawyers assured them that the act was of no legal force whatever, and advised them to go back and sue for their salaries. They followed the advice, and the Rev. Thomas Warrington, of Elizabeth City, made up his case as a test. His plea was that the act was inequitable, in that it, without warning and without redress, cut down the salaries from four hundred pounds to one hundred and fifty pounds; that it was a breach of contract which was perilous to every citizen; that the act was null and void wanting the royal indorsement. The case for the vestry, against whom his suit was brought, was so bad that no lawyer with a reputation would touch it. When the case was imminent, there chanced to be a lawyer without either legal reputation or social standing, himself a Churchman, who was willing to undertake it. His name was Patrick Henry. His argument before the jury raised him to celebrity at a bound, showed his wonderful sagacity, and brought into dazzling vividness the Church's position in America. He brushed away all question of either law or technical equity. He declared that England had no essential right to tax this country for any purpose; that the colonies had both the right and the ability to regulate their own affairs, religious as well as civil; that the only purpose of religion which law can recognize is its function of making good citizens; that the community wherein this function is exercised must regulate it; that the

Patrick Henry.

clergy by appealing to a foreign state had proven themselves to be at once bad citizens and unworthy ministers. These contentions he made effective, not only, and probably not chiefly, through his overwhelming eloquence, but because he put into words, biting, burning, unforgettable words, the sentiments which were and had long been vaguely in the people's hearts. In any case, through the plea of a man himself a devout communicant of the Church, addressed to a jury composed of hereditary Churchmen, the Church in the person of its clergy was defeated in a case where it had all the law, all the justice, and all the traditions of a hundred and fifty years on its side. The Church appealed to Cæsar, — and lost. The appeal was never repeated. The breach was final.[1] Ten years later, it was evident to all that the Church could not grow in America until it should be, either by kindly or forcible means, disentangled from the English state.

The Church in other colonies.

Passing southward from Virginia, the population gradually became more sparse, and clustered about Charleston and Savannah as its chief points of radiation. The Church life in Oglethorpe's Georgia settlement will come in sight in connection with Whitefield and the Wesleys and the Methodist movement. In North Carolina it remained weak throughout the century. The Scotch and later on the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians early made a lodgement in the territory, and became, in connection with the Baptists,[2] the dominant religious influence. In

[1] Tyler: Patrick Henry, p. 77.

[2] Benedict: History of the Baptist Denomination in America. Boston, 1820, p. 333.

South Carolina at the opening of the eighteenth century, there was one strong parish at Charleston, — the only one in the province. Between that time and the Revolution it had gained another parish in the same city, had spread to Beaufort, and from there as a second centre, to Goosecreek, Prince George, Santee, through and among the new plantations, and in the new settlements, as they one by one sprang up.[1] As early as 1707 the S. P. G. maintained six clergy in the province and had sent over two thousand volumes of books for gratuitous distribution.[2] Two-thirds of the population at the beginning of the century were Dissenters. This proportion was increased by a stream of immigration from Massachusetts and the Northern colonies. The Church of England, on the other hand, was swelled by a considerable number of French Huguenots, whose names still survive. An ill-advised and impotent attempt to establish the Church, with rigorous laws against the Dissenters, — an attempt so indefensible that Queen Anne declared the act null and void, and the S. P. G. refused to send any more missionaries till it should be abandoned, — gained the ill-will of the majority of the people. In spite, however, of the internal broils in the colony, of frequent and wasteful wars with the Indians; in spite of the demoralizing effect of slavery, which, owing to the rice culture, showed itself more quickly in South Carolina than elsewhere,[3] the Church continued to more than hold her own until the

[1] J. J. Pringle Smith, in Perry: History, vol. i. p. 638.
[2] Graham: Colonial History, vol. i. p. 389.
[3] Ib.: p. 292.

great cataclysm.[1] A larger proportion of native-born clergy were probably produced in this than in any other colony save Connecticut. This fact kept the priesthood and people more in touch with each other, and saved the Church there from much of the evil which befell her in Maryland and Virginia.

In the Northern group of colonies the Commissary *régime* was little more than a name. The local churches, for the most part, managed their own affairs.

[1] Perry: History, vol. i. p. 394.

CHAPTER XII.

THE NEW ENGLAND CONVERTS.

President Cutler.

In the early years of the last century there lived at Guilford, Conn., a certain Mr. Smithson, whose name has been kept from oblivion through a single kindly deed of his. He gave a Prayer-Book to young Timothy Cutler, a graduate of Harvard, and a candidate for the Puritan ministry. In 1720 the Rev. Dr. Cutler was the honored president of Yale College, and had read his Prayer-Book to good purpose. Remote from the Church, unskilled in her ways, holding high office in a society which was her hereditary enemy, he had learned to love the Prayer-Book, and to think of the Church kindly. Many of the prayers he committed to memory, and used, consciously and unconsciously, in his conduct of public worship. Their spirit colored all his own effusions, until he came to be noted for his "gifts in prayer."[1] He gathered about him a little group of men like-minded with himself, and for several years they quietly and patiently pursued a study of the nature and organization of the Church. Just a century before, this had been the burning question of the age. But at that time the combatants on either hand had not been in a temper to settle it on its merits. With

[1] Beardsley: History of the Church in Connecticut, vol. i. p. 34.

Laud on the one side and the Puritans on the other, Star Chamber writs, broadswords, and pikes had been the weapons. The sparks struck in such collisions are brilliant but not illuminating. The Truth had shrunk away into the background, as she always does to avoid strife. But now the contest had long ago subsided. Episcopacy had won in Old England and Presbytery in the New. The parties to the strife deemed the matter settled because they were out of each other's hearing. President Cutler and his friends were Presbyterians, but students, calm-minded and lovers of truth.

The question of Orders.

A question pressed upon them which is one of the most imperious that can assail any man, and is, at the same time, one for the entertainment of which he usually receives little sympathy. To speak for God as His minister is the most awful prerogative that any man can assume. No sober-minded man will offer to do so without the clearest warrant. But from where shall he receive this warrant? No man can give it to him of his own authority. He cannot trust to his own inward "call," for he knows too well the untrustworthiness of human emotions. Whence shall he derive a commission which will justify him to himself in the assumption of so great an office? An honest search for the answer to this question has led into the ministry of this Church a large proportion of her priesthood. They ask themselves, "By what authority doest thou these things, and who gave thee this authority?" The unique honor of being the first of this class in the American Church belongs to President Cutler and the little group of Puritan ministers who gathered

about him. The college library provided the means to solve their doubts. Scant as it was, it fortunately contained the works of Barrow, Tillotson, Burnet, Sherlock, Patrick, and Whitby, masters[1] of definition and argument for the Episcopal theory of the Church. Slowly, and evidently with reluctance, the little band of students were forced to the conclusion that their ministerial commissions were defective, not because their acts under them were lacking in power, — a pirate or a guerilla chieftain may be potent without any commission, — but because they were lacking in authority, emanating as they did from an organization which had separated itself from the league of Christian States. "I hoped," says one of them, "that when I was ordained I had satisfied myself of the validity of Presbyterian ordination under the circumstances. But alas! I have ever since had growing suspicions that all is not right, and that I am an usurper in the House of God." Of course, this will seem but the vagary of a diseased sentiment, to all who think of the Church as organized by men and deriving its authority from the consent of its members. But he who has a deep sense of the very reality of priestly acts, especially if he have a timid conscience, will understand and sympathize with his perplexity. Gradually the convictions of the little company settled upon the Church of England. It attracted them, not as a strong political establishment, — its political entanglement was but a stumbling-block to them; not by the sweet strains of its Liturgy, — that sound had never fallen

The Church's attraction.

[1] Beardsley: History of the Church in Connecticut, vol. i. p. 35.

upon their ears ; not by its formulated dogmas, — these did not seriously differ from those which they held already ; but solely by its power as an Apostolic Church to confer a valid commission upon men to preach the Divine Word and administer the awful Sacraments. This clear and simple conviction determined their action, and, through them and their spiritual successors, went far to fix in that mould in which it is still held, the American Church's way of thinking of the ministry.

Few of these men's confrères knew or suspected the direction in which they were moving. At the college commencement Sept. 13, 1722, President Cutler asked the trustees to meet him in the library at the close of the exercises. When all were assembled he read them a statement which acted upon them, and through them upon New England society, like an electric shock. The statement, signed by himself and six tutors and fellows of the college, stripped to simplicity, was, that the signers were doubtful of or convinced against the validity of Presbyterian ordination, and had determined to apply for Orders in the Church of England. The surprise and consternation were indescribable. It was as though in our day the president and faculty of Princeton should declare for the Pope, or the dean and professors of the General Seminary should avow themselves Quakers. Lamentation resounded on every hand. A day of fasting and prayer was called to avert the Divine wrath at the strange defection of these leaders in Israel. The converts had offered to make a public statement and defence of their position if it should be

desired. It was desired, and a day for the great debate fixed during the session of the Connecticut Legislature. The Governor, Saltonstall, presided with courtesy and fairness, rebuking the railing spirit in which their opponents conducted their arguments. Of course nothing came of the debate but to fix each side more firmly in its own opinion. Cutler was "excused" from any further duties in the college. Three of his associates resigned their charges and cast in their lot with him, burning their bridges behind them. Several, more timid or less convinced, retained their connection with the Puritan establishment, but preserving all their lives a friendly attitude toward the Church. Three of them, Cutler, Brown, and Johnson, proceeded at once to England for ordination. Their name and fame had gone before them. They were received with a warm welcome. Cutler and Johnson were ordained, but Brown perished of smallpox. A second parish lately organized in Boston called Cutler to be its rector. Johnson went to Stratford, where there had been for many years a little group of Church of England families, became their pastor, and entered upon that long career of use and influence hardly surpassed by any name in the Church's annals. He was invited by Benjamin Franklin to become the head of the newly organized College of Philadelphia, later known as the University of Pennsylvania. He declined, and accepted another invitation to the presidency of King's College, afterward Columbia University.

President Cutler and professors enter the Church.

The great gain to the American Church by this move-

ment was not that she had added half a dozen able men to her meagre ministry. It was that a new and abiding source of supply had been opened. These were but the advanced guard of a host of men of similar type who have entered the Church since their time from the same motives. It was the sporadic outbreak in America of the movement which had set in still earlier in England. "At this time there was a strong tendency in the Presbyterian type of Puritanism to conform in England. . . . A little reasonableness on the part of the English bishops would have swept the entire Presbyterian party of England into the Established Church."[1] Their influence was at once felt in New England, beginning in Connecticut. Within a generation the Church under the leadership of a native born ministry had penetrated every town, had effected a lodgement in every Puritan stronghold, had drawn into her membership large numbers of that sober-minded, self-contained, tenacious people who constitute her membership in New England to-day. The opposition of the Puritan authorities was pronounced and bitter. It showed itself in a series of petty and vexatious acts of persecution, some of which amounted to grievous wrongs. But the innate kindliness and cautious fair-mindedness of the Connecticut people constantly interposed to break the blows of Puritan zeal.[2] Laws were made which worked in favor of the "Established Order" and against the Church, and remained in force for a hundred and

Beginning of a movement.

Puritan opposition.

[1] Briggs: American Presbyterianism, p. 146.
[2] Perry: History, i. 290, *et seq.*

fifty years.[1] Occasionally they wrought great hardship, but, upon the whole, the Church in New England had less to complain of in the eighteenth century than dissenters had in New York and the Southern colonies. The idea of invoking force of any sort to the aid of doctrine or order was gradually but surely retiring into that evil place from which it had emerged to curse the Church of God.

Dean Berkeley.

The drift toward the Church in New England received a very substantial impulse by the visit to America of one of England's great and holy men. In 1729 Dean Berkeley commenced his three years' sojourn at Newport in the interest of his brilliant but fruitless scheme of a great American University. His plan was to establish somewhere a foundation which should be to the colonies what Oxford and Cambridge were to Britain. It is his great honor to have been the first of eminent Englishmen to discern the future greatness of the western world. He prayed and strove that it might be built up upon the twin foundations of religion and learning. He was himself a notable example of both. By dint of his wonderful power of persuading men, and the sweet graciousness of his person, he had extorted from the English minister, Walpole, a grant of twenty thousand pounds for his American University. But to secure the grant was one thing, to secure the money quite another. Walpole intimated to him that it would not

[1] It was not until 1878 that the parishes in Connecticut were at liberty to organize according to the Church's theory; up to that time they were all chartered as Congregational "Societies" under a general act.

likely be paid unless he should show his earnestness in the matter by going himself to America. In pursuance of this advice, he took up his abode at Newport. His reputation as a philosopher, a scholar, and a saint, had preceded him. Learned men in America made pilgrimages to meet him, and came away unconsciously biassed in favor of a Church which could produce and retain such a man. The fact that the representatives of royalty in the colonies were always Churchmen had had its effect in attracting many to her. Now the fact that a prince in the kingdom of letters was one of her sons brought her into reputation in a different quarter. His visitors went to see a philosopher and found also a Churchman. The effect of his sojourn was marked in many ways. His friend the painter Smibert followed his fortunes, and from Smibert the Americans Copley and West caught their inspiration.[1] When he returned to England, despairing of his project, he left his library of one thousand volumes to Yale College and gave his Rhode Island farm to found a post-graduate scholarship in the same university. These gifts were golden benefactions to the struggling learning of the time. From his foundation at Yale, a stream of great men have gone forth, all more or less influenced by his spirit, and with a kindly feeling towards the Church of their benefactor. By his gift the immortal writings of Hooker and Chillingworth found a place in the college library and moulded the lives of many of the seekers after the Church.[2] His advice and counsel fixed in the structure

[1] Arnold: History of Rhode Island, ii. p. 99.
[2] Beardsley: Life of Samuel Johnson, p. 75.

of Pennsylvania University and Columbia College, that principle of union in religion and learning which these institutions so long retained.[1] As a Christian, a Churchman, and a man, he greatly promoted the success which marked the Church in the Northern colonies through the first half of the eighteenth century.

[1] Beardsley: Life of Samuel Johnson, p. 75.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE "GREAT AWAKENING."

In 1735 Jonathan Edwards was pastor of the Puritan church of Northampton, Massachusetts.[1] Young man as he was, he was already famous. When a mere child, he knew Greek and Hebrew. When a lad, he pondered deeply upon "fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute." In his beautiful body dwelt the fairest of souls, and the subtlest of understandings. His sweet young wife had also dreamed dreams and seen visions. A pair of mystics, enthusiasts, poets, and theologians, they journeyed hand in hand to his first parish at Northampton. He began his ministry at the time when the lament was heard on every hand that pure religion was perishing from off the face of the earth. The lament was not without cause. A distinct relaxation of religious life had already set in, and was as marked in New England as elsewhere in the colonies. "It began as soon as it was evident that the unique experiment of the Puritan fathers was over, when the theocracy which had inspired such enthusiasm was hastening to its downfall. It was as if God had turned away from favoring an enterprise which had His glory

Jonathan Edwards.

[1] Allen: Life of Jonathan Edwards, pp. 133, 248.
[1] Tracy: The Great Awakening, Boston, 1845, *passim*.

in view as its sole object and justification."[1] The fierce religionism of the early Puritan life could not be sustained. In a century it had burned itself out. A revolt against its hard and exacting spirit had already spread. Only the shell of it remained. The strong, if unlovely, life which had tenanted it was dying. Its remaining energy was wasting itself in theological quarrels barren of permanent result.[2] Meanwhile, carelessness of religion and looseness of living were rife. Edwards's deeply religious spirit was profoundly moved by the situation when he came to realize it. Believing, as he did with all his being, in the inborn helplessness of all men to do or think any good thing, in a heaven whose ravishing beauty his poetic eye could see, and a hell whose blackness and torment were to him a very present fact, his preaching assumed a tone which had not before been heard. His great store of theology furnished him with matter, his poetic instinct enabled him to set it in colors which men could not help but see, his psychologic skill qualified him to find a lodgement for his words in the heart and imagination of every hearer. Such sermons as his had never been heard. From preaching to his people once on Sunday, he came to preaching thrice. Then they came in crowds to hear him on a week-day as well. Then he preached every day. Then all business was gradually laid aside, and the people asked, "Brethren, what must I do to be saved?" All human concerns fell into insignificance before the great question in the

The "Revival" at Northampton.

[1] Allen: p. 53.
[2] e. g., the "Half-way Covenant."

presence of which the whole community sat down in despair.

The peculiar answer which Edwards gave to this question has profoundly affected the religious life of America, shaped the fortunes of the Church, and yet dominates the Christian life of the land. Before his time both Churchman and Puritan had conceived of religion as an outward life. It was obedience to a law or set of laws. It consisted of moral and religious *conduct*. The two parties had differed profoundly and often as to what particular action or class of actions were bounden on a Christian, but they had been at one in the assumption that religion is a question of right *living*.[1]

Edwards's theory of "Conversion."

Edwards taught that it was a question of right *feeling*. His theory has passed into the popular mind and is yet dominant. He replied to the eager questionings of his Northampton people that "conversion" is a drama which must perforce be played out consciously in each individual soul. Its characteristic stages were, *first*, a profound and awful sense of sin, guilt, helplessness, fear of God's wrath, dread of dire penalty, an internal agony which might border close upon madness; *second*, a period more or less prolonged of doubtfulness, hope alternated with despair, glimpses of God's mercy only to be obscured by the vapors rising from a corrupt heart; *third*, a sudden and conscious emergence into a haven of sweet peace, a serene and heavenly frame, a sense

[1] Roger Williams had been banished for teaching that it is an inward experience.

of pardoned sin and acceptance with God. He and his gracious wife, children of God from the womb, persuaded themselves that they had passed through this sequence of experiences. He watched over his inquirers, and led them with infinite skill through its stages, — preserving the while the curious attitude of a scientific observer of the phenomena, — and helped them to find peace for their souls.

His peculiar doctrine of salvation possesses singular fascination for the populace. It is capable of being put to an immediate test. It is less burdensome and exacting than it is to confront with a definite Christian purpose the complex and contradictory experiences of human life.

"Bodily exercises."

The revival quickly passed beyond the bounds of the Northampton parish, but by the time it had done so it had taken on another peculiarity even more striking. In the spiritual agony through which awakened souls were passing daily, the bodies of some began to show a strange sympathy. Men fell prostrate upon the earth and lay writhing, they lost temporarily the power of speech, their limbs moved rhythmically, heaven and hell became visible to their fixed and staring eyes. This new phenomenon for the moment staggered Edwards, but he soon satisfied himself that it came from God. Why should not the body sympathize with the soul? It was but the outward sign of the inward and invisible grace at work. He at once encouraged and tried to regulate the strange manifestation. The outbreak of this new phenomenon attracted fresh attention to the movement. It began

to spread. Sober and godly men set themselves against it in vain. Such opposition is always but half-hearted, from fear lest haply one be found fighting against God. Deerfield, Springfield, and far-away New Haven were "awakened." Churchmen and the more conservative Presbyterians stood aloof from the movement,[1] but the latter, after a long stand against "enthusiasm," succumbed. The movement gathered strength and impetus as it spread. Gilbert and William Tennent became its leaders in New Jersey. It swept in the Scotch Presbyterians in the back settlements of Pennsylvania. It worked down the valleys of Virginia, and drew in the multitudes of lapsed and indifferent Churchmen. It climbed the mountains into Tennessee and Kentucky. It found a welcome among the mystical German sects, and touched the mercurial Welsh Churchmen among the foot-hills of the Alleghanies. As it moved on through its seventy years' course its distinctive features became more and more marked. Strangest of all, they ceased to excite surprise, and came to be accepted as the ordinary concomitants of religion. An eye-witness narrates[2] that "a hundred and fifty of the congregation were so affected with violent spasmodic contractions of the muscles, jerking their heads quickly from side to side, frequently throwing their persons upon the ground, where they floundered like live fish. I have seen all denominations of religion exercised the same way, — gentleman and lady, black and white, young and old,

Spread of the movement.

The "jerks."

[1] Briggs: American Presbyterian, pp. 251-2.
[2] Tracy: Great Awakening, p. 222.

without exception. I have passed a meeting-house about which the undergrowth had been cut away, leaving a hundred saplings standing breast-high, for the people to hold on to when they should have the *jerks*. I observed that when they had held on by them they had kicked up the earth as a horse does when stamping flies." Not only converts were so seized, but those who came to mock as well as those who came to pray. Sometimes it took grotesque and ludicrous forms. Some turned unseemly somersaults in the air; others leaped and yelled as the devil in departing rended them; and once a pack of men were found barking up a tree where they had "treed the devil."[1]

Meets Whitefield.

When the movement reached Georgia it came in contact with the Church of England in the person of George Whitefield. In response to Wesley's cry for aid, Whitefield had come out to Oglethorpe's colony as missionary to the Indians. Few men were ever less fitted for that duty. Wisdom, patience, caution, the qualities which the missionary to the heathen needs, Whitefield had none of. Half-educated, impetuous, self-conscious, ignorant of himself, impatient of law, but with a burning religious zeal, and a power of popular eloquence as great as was ever given to mortal man, he was fitted to become the champion of the "Great Awakening." Laying aside all his plans and work, and disregarding all authority, he took up the burden of Jonathan Edwards's prophecy. Bearing Whitefield on its crest, a reflex wave of enthusiasm swept back northward,

[1] McMaster: History of the People of the United States, vol. ii. p. 580.

upturning Church order, sweeping some into the kingdom and leaving others stranded at its ebb, until the two prophets met in Edwards's parsonage in little Northampton. Whitefield's presence was a stumbling-stone and a rock of offence. He was a clergyman of the Church of England. With but very few exceptions, his brethren had held aloof from or definitely opposed the movement. Its root principle seemed to them to be both false and dangerous. Whitefield assailed them savagely, as his successors have often done since, for their bearing toward "this gracious work of God." "Unconverted men;" "without vital piety;" "pagans;" "dumb dogs that will not bark," were the best words he had for them. He ostentatiously turned his back upon his fellows, and became the hero of the revivalists. The Puritan clergy made much of his zeal, contrasting it with the cold morality of the Church to the latter's great discredit. Churchmen either openly defended their position or waited for the reaction which was sure to come. It came even sooner than they had expected. The disorders which arise from the prevalence of a religion of the emotions divorced from the ordinances of the Church and the sanctions of the conscience soon made themselves seen.[1] The "travelling

Attitude of Churchmen to the "Revival."

The reaction.

[1] The Rev. Timothy Cutler writes from Boston, September 24, 1743: "Whitefield has plagued us with a witness, especially his friends and followers, who themselves are like to be battered to pieces by that battering-ram they had provided against our Church here. It would be an endless attempt to describe that scene of confusion and disturbance occasioned by him, — the division of families, neighborhoods, and towns, the contrariety of husbands and wives, the undutifulness of children and servants, the quarrels among teachers, the disorders of the night, the intermission of labor and business, the neglect of husbandry and of

preachers" who swarmed in New England brought such confusion into even the "Established Order" that the Puritan ministers themselves could not endure it. Whitefield turned away in dudgeon from the gentle rebuke of Edwards for his ill-tempered zeal, returned to England, and exercised his wonderful gifts, held in order by the tight hand of the Countess of Huntingdon. Edwards found the hearts of his own converts and parishioners turned against him. They whom he had carried through the crisis of their religious experiences refused longer to listen to him. Disappointed and heart-broken, he turned his steps away from his beloved Northampton, to his new home among the savage Indians.

gathering the harvest. Our presses are forever teeming with books, and our women with bastards, though regeneration and conversion is the whole cry. The teachers have, many of them, left their particular cures, and strolled about the country. Some have been ordained by them *Evangelizers*, and had their *Armor-bearers* and *Exhorters;* and in many conventicles and places of rendezvous there has been checkered work, indeed, several preaching, and several exhorting and praying at the same time, the rest crying or laughing, yelping, sprawling, fainting, and this revel maintained in some places many days and nights together, without intermission; and then there were the blessed outpourings of the Spirit!

"When Mr. Whitefield first arrived here the whole town was alarmed. He made his first visit to church on a Friday, and conversed first with many of our clergy together, belied them, me especially, when he had done. Being not invited into our pulpits, the Dissenters were highly pleased, and engrossed him; and immediately the bells rung, and all hands went to lecture; and this show kept on all the while he was here.

"After him came one *Tennent*, a monster! impudent and noisy, and told them they were all *damn'd*, damn'd, damn'd; this charmed them, and in the most dreadful winter I ever saw, people wallowed in the snow night and day for the benefit of his beastly brayings; and many ended their days under these fatigues. Both of them carried more money out of these parts than the poor could be thankful for.

"All this turned to the growth of the Church in many places, and its reputation universally; and it suffers no otherwise than as religion in general does, and that is sadly enough."

The effect of the movement upon the religious life of America cannot be over-estimated. It obliterated the old ecclesiastical divisions, and drew a new line of cleavage. It set and fixed the Church in that position which she still holds in American Protestantism. She was thrust by it involuntarily into that place which has proven her stronghold. There have been in this country since the "Great Awakening," and chiefly as its result, two radically distinct conceptions of Christianity. According to one theory it is primarily an experience, following in the main that which Edwards first fastened upon the popular mind. It appeals to consciousness. It devises machinery to awake the emotions. When they flag it has whips to stimulate them anew. It has the "Pilgrim's Progress" for its hornbook. Christian, the pilgrim, is the type of the truly converted man. It makes little of Sacraments. It empties them of their grace, and finds their rationale as a system of mnemonics. It distinguishes sharply between religion and morality. It uses faith as a word representing not the thing believed, but only the act of believing. It speaks its mind unconsciously in Moody and Sankey's hymns.

Effect upon American religion.

For the other theory the Church stands as the best accredited representative. This has for its starting-point not the adult, but the Christian child. It assumes it to be a child of God. It leans on Christian nurture. It looks upon the Church as the hospitable home in which all have a right; a right not contingent upon the passage through a conventional experience. It looks upon the Sacraments not as the

The Church's position.

marks and badges of a pious life already attained, but as the means of attainment thereto. It makes little of experiences. It is distrustful of spiritual cataclysms. It thinks that religious life to be most healthy which is least self-conscious. It refuses to distinguish between religion and morality, deeming them the same in essence.

For all this the Church has stood since the middle of the last century. The two contrasted conceptions of personal religion, of course, did not begin at that date. But the effect of the Great Awakening was to bring out their contrast before the popular sense, and to fix the Church's place as the representative of the latter. Her growth has always been most rapid in those communities where the rival theory has most completely run its course. But she has not remained uninfluenced by it. Much of the real religious life which was present in the movement passed into her possession. It has saved her from being hard and mechanical. The Evangelical movement which came two generations afterwards brought into her ministry men who accepted Edwards's theory wholly, preached it, lived by it, championed it, faulted the Church for not accepting it outright, were as great and as good as any prophets who have ever delivered their message from her pulpits. But as a school they passed away and left the Church in the same attitude in which they found her. The spirit of the Great Awakening speaks in some of the Church's hymns, modifies her practice in deciding upon the fitness of candidates for Confirmation, leads her often to adopt a

Its influence upon the Church.

popular phraseology which does not mean the same from her lips that it does from others; but, upon the whole, her ideal of the Christian life has remained unchanged.

Here is to be found the secret of her steady growth at the expense of American Protestantism. The Episcopal Church is the only one which constantly gains from others, and seldom loses to them. They who lose, in their chagrin, often charge her with holding a low and easily attained standard of religious life. This is not the explanation. Her accessions are from those whose religious life is highest and deepest, but whose spiritual experience refuses to fit itself to the mould into which it is attempted to cast it. These, who seek righteousness of life, and are tortured as Edwards's poor people were through their feelings, seek the Church as the home of reasonable religion.[1]

[1] It would be an interesting study to trace the effect of the Great Awakening upon the negro race in America. There is good reason to believe that their peculiar type of emotional religiousness, divorced from the sanctions of conscience, is due to this movement, which for the first time brought within their reach a conception of Christianity which fitted itself to their peculiar race temperament. There does not seem to be any evidence of their characteristic type of religion previous to this time. Since then it has dominated them as a people.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE GERMANS.

WHILE the Commissaries were reforming the Church in the south, notable scholars coming to her aid in the east, and the Great Awakening was stirring the religious life of the whole land, the last great wave of pre-Revolutionary immigration broke over the middle colonies. It came from two quarters, Germany and Ireland. It brought in two great populations, one of whom has always remained indifferent and the other opposed to Episcopacy.

First German immigration.

The ceaseless wars which became inevitable on the Continent of Europe when the Reformation motto *cujus regio, ejus religio*, was adopted, had wrought incalculable damage in Germany. The condition of the common people was deplorable. While the country was prolific of great scholars and leaders of the Reformation, the mass of the people retained much of their mediæval barbarism. The feudal spirit which made his people patient of the great Frederick's cane, and still keeps the citizens of a mighty empire docile under the personal rule of the Kaiser, made the common folk then helpless to rise out of their low state. Continual wars, changes of rule, changes of faith, bad government, made their lives intolerable.[1] Like the

[1] Seebohm: Era of Protestant Revolution, p. 33.

unfortunate in all lands they turned their faces to America. In the last years of the seventeenth century they began to come. The bulk of them came to Penn's colony. Through his German mother and his own sojourn at Cresheim on the Rhine, Penn knew them and they knew him. In 1683 Pastorius brought the first detachment of twenty families, sat down with them six miles from Philadelphia, and properly named the first German settlement Germantown.[1] A few recruits followed from time to time, but thirty years later immigration came *en masse*. In 1709 a horrible famine wasted their fatherland. Thousands perished of cold and hunger.[2] The heart of the world, which at that time was not easily moved at the sight of suffering, turned toward the poor, dying creatures with compassion. Good Queen Anne of England offered to give them lands and homes in America and to help them move. Multitudes took her at her word. Thirty thousand made their way to London to escape starvation through the queen's goodness.[3] So many additional hungry mouths threatened to set up a famine there. The brutal populace of the city fell upon them in their poor camp at Blackmoor, beat them, drove them off to beg and starve among the lanes and hedges. Five thousand of them, being Roman Catholics, were sent back to Germany. Four thousand were sent to Ireland to settle waste lands about Limerick. The remainder, more than twenty thousand in number, were sent to America. Ten ships brought five thousand of them to New York at one

[1] Reichel: Moravian History, p. 15.
[2] Ib. p. 15.
[3] Ib. p. 16.

time. They were carried up the Hudson and moved in behind the Dutch, who had lived for half a century on its western bank.[1] Their descendants are still found about Scoharie, Schenectady, Palatine Bridge, and westward to the head-waters of the Susquehanna. But the main stream came up the Delaware. Philadelphia was their entrepôt. Before the middle of the century the immigration had reached and sustained itself for several years at twelve thousand annually.[2] They moved in behind the English and Welsh and sat down upon the rich limestone soil which stretches westward to the Susquehanna. From Pennsylvania they crept southward into Virginia and western Maryland. A smaller, independent stream flowed into North Carolina and farther south.[3] At the outbreak of the Revolution they constituted one-third the population of Pennsylvania.[4] Their religious and social condition was of the very lowest. Ignorant when they left home, their exposure and suffering reduced them still lower. Many of them came as "Redemptioners," that is, persons who had sold themselves either outright or for a limited number of years to some shipmaster for the amount of their passage money. The advertisement pages of the dingy newspapers of the time are full of notices of rewards for runaway "Dutch servants." They were harshly treated, and upon the smallest excuse or no excuse at all had their time of servitude lengthened until many became hopeless bond slaves.

The "Pennsylvania Dutch."

[1] Smith: History of New York, p. 139.
[2] Proud: History of Pennsylvania, vol. ii. p. 273.
[3] Williamson: History of North Carolina, vol. i. p. 184.
[4] Proud: History of Pennsylvania, vol. ii. p. 273.

From a religious point of view they were all classified as "Lutherans." The distinction which the Germans began early to make between Lutherans and Reformed was not observed by English-speaking people in describing them. The various German sects were in popular speech lumped together as Lutherans, that is, Germans who were not Romanists. With the exception of the few leaders, and leading German families who were broadly marked off from the rank and file of their people, the mass were for the most part indifferent to religion in any form. The few preachers who at first accompanied their flocks gradually found their graves in the western wilds, or if yet living, their influence on new-comers was very slight. There were thousands, who, educated in Germany as Lutherans, but now scattered about in the forest wilds of America, never saw a church or cared for it. Many were so utterly indifferent to all religion that it became proverbial to say of those who cared nothing for God or His Word, that they belonged to "the Pennsylvania Church."[1] The chronic tendency of German Protestantism to division made their religious condition worse. They became a congeries of sects, some of them holding as their distinguishing mark the most grotesque and whimsical practice or tenet. The mystical "Mennonite" would not allow the baptism of infants, would not take an oath, refused to bear arms, and wore a peculiar dress. The "Tunkers" held to the same theological and ethical views, but wore a different dress, and made it a point of faith to wear their beards untouched by blade

Their religious character and condition.

[1] Spangenberg: Life of Zinzendorf, p. 1230.

or scissors. The "Siebentagen" observed the seventh day of the week instead of the first to keep it holy, denounced marriage as a snare of Satan, lived in community, established an order of Protestant monks and nuns, and built for themselves monasteries, the broken walls of which still stand.[1] Anchorites lived solitary lives far in the forest, and hermits made their homes in the rocky caves along the Wissahickon. Besides these, Schwenkfelders and separatists of now forgotten names abounded. Their type may be seen in one sect which still exists, whose distinctive dogma is that men should wear hooks and eyes instead of buttons to fasten their clothes!

The numbers and character of the incoming Germans seriously alarmed the colonial authorities, and, after a prolonged agitation, it was checked and ultimately stopped by the imposition of a tax of forty shillings a head upon all comers. But before this was done the Germans who are now known as "Pennsylvania Dutch" had established themselves in a circle of settlements which surrounded the Church of England at those points where it was strongest. There they have remained ever since. They have preserved their original features of character and religious life with a tenacity which hardly any other class in America can equal. Simple-minded and coarse in fibre, but strong and pertinacious, they have held their own, and the Church has made but little impress upon them. With the exception of the great and saintly Muhlenbergs, and a few others of kindred spirit, their names are absent from her rolls.

[1] At Ephrata, Lancaster Co., Penn.

The Moravian Church came among them at a later date, and has since held in their midst much the same place that the Episcopal Church has among the English-speaking Protestants. It, though small in numbers, has probably affected the religious life of America more profoundly, though indirectly, than have the vastly more numerous German Lutheran and Reformed. Bishop Nitschman, in Savannah, became the teacher of the Churchman John Wesley. The Moravian Peter Böhler, as we shall see, gave him that cast of religious life which made him the founder of Methodism. Whitefield was their friend and co-worker. He bought for them five thousand acres of land at the forks of the Delaware to found a school for negroes, which was to be administered by them,[1] and then quarrelled with them and took the land away. But he retained that bias which his intercourse with Peter Böhler had given him, and, during his restless wanderings up and down the colonies, was more under the domination of the Moravian than the English Church.

The Moravians.

[1] Reichel: Moravian History, p. 78.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SCOTCH-IRISH.

England and Scotland at the Reformation.

At the period of the Reformation England and Scotland were two separate nations, as distinct as the United States and Canada now are. England had through her whole history resisted, and in the end beat off, the aggressions of the Papacy. Scotland had succumbed almost entirely. When the time came, the Reformation had more to do in Scotland, had to do it by a harder battle, against greater odds, in the face of established authorities, religious and secular, and through a far more bitter experience, than fell to the lot of her neighbor. In England the king and officers of state, the bishops and leading clergy, led the movement. In Scotland all these opposed it. In England Episcopacy emerged from the long struggle intact. In Scotland it went down before the people's determination to reform, which purpose the bishops opposed. The Reformed Church of Scotland never forgot that the bishops had joined hands with the Papal enemy.

Calvinism and Presbyterianism.

Wishart and Knox brought into it the Calvinism and Presbyterianism which they had learned at Basle and Frankfort and Geneva in the days of their exile. The twin system of Dogma and Organization struck its roots in the very fabric

of the Scottish mind and character. It has lived there a more vigorous and tenacious life than elsewhere in the world. When it had decayed at Geneva it flourished at Edinburgh. When it had become loosened and capable of revision there, it is found in its pristine strength at Pittsburg. When the Protestant Revolution had subsided, Episcopacy had been rooted out in Scotland, and the soil where it had grown sown with the salt of Calvinism. When the two crowns were united in that of James I, there began that long struggle for supremacy between the two peoples whose history had been so diverse. The match was not conspicuously unequal. The advantage which the more numerous population of England gave her was counterbalanced by the profound conviction and fierce tenacity of purpose which marked the Scotch. The stake at issue was the control of the ecclesiastical organization of the United Kingdom. The issue was by no means a foregone conclusion. If the English won when swords and muskets were the weapons, the Scotch knew how to "jouk an' let the jaw go by," and gain their end by cautious and patient diplomacy. Once, at least, they succeeded in having the "Solemn League and Covenant" against prelacy sworn to by monarch and parliament, and Presbyterianism made the law of the land. But the southern half of the kingdom steadily outgrew the northern, and in the long run numbers tell. Presbyterianism was beaten back beyond the border; Episcopacy crossed in pursuit, by the same path upon which the Covenant had once come southward. The ecclesiastical authority of the realm set about to exter-

Presbyterianism and Episcopacy.

minate Presbyterianism, as it, in its turn, had attacked Episcopacy.

In the contest from this time onward the weight of suffering fell upon the Scotch. It was a game of hammer and anvil, and the English wielded the hammer. In the last quarter of the seventeenth century the Scotch Presbyterian's life was a burden to him. "Uniformity" acts, "Test" acts, "Conventicle" acts, entangled him at every turn. It was a felony to worship otherwise than by the Book of Common Prayer, to conduct family worship when more than five beside the household were present, to preach without permission of the bishop, to boggle at abjuring the Covenant which the Presbyterian held sacred, to absent one's self from the parish church. All synods, presbyteries, and sessions were declared illegal. A new hierarchy was set up, with a renegade Presbyterian at its head. Ignorant and godless priests were set in charge of the churches.[1] The laws were enforced by sequestrations, fines, the gaol, the stocks, boot, thumbscrews, pillory, and the gallows. But all in vain. The stern stuff of which Scotch Presbyterianism was made finally prevailed, and the Presbytery became established north of the Tweed.

Episcopal rigor.

Meanwhile many to whom life had become intolerable sought refuge in Ireland, then a sort of No-man's-land. A sheriff's writ could hardly cross the Channel, and the moss troopers were not there to harry them. They were welcomed as thrifty tenants upon the large, half-waste tracts held by Eng-

Emigration to Ireland.

[1] Burnet: History of His Own Time, i. p. 229.

lish land-owners. But as the civilization of the island increased, its whilom obscurity ceased to shelter them. The same contest of argument and arms between the bishops and the Presbyterians, which had wasted Scotland, sprang up in Ireland. The bitterest theological controversies, diversified by passages at arms, occupied a whole generation. Finally it embittered the relations between land-owning Churchmen and the Presbyterian tenantry. The "Antrim Evictions" left thousands of them without home or shelter. In two years thirty thousand emigrated to America.[1] They found many of their kin already here. The prisoners taken at Dunbar and Bothwell Brig fifty years before had been sold as slaves to the plantations.[2] Scotch noblemen and gentlemen had bought large lands for their fellow-religionists in South Carolina. There were settlements of them in Virginia and Maryland. But at the opening of the eighteenth century they began to come in like a flood. Boston, Philadelphia, and Charleston were the principal places of entry. Of these, Philadelphia was the favorite. Whole congregations came, bringing their ministers with them. "In the first half of the century, Down, Antrim, Armagh, and Derry were emptied."[3] In 1740 the immigration had reached twelve thousand a year to Philadelphia alone.[4] They halted but a little at the seaboard, but passed at once through the coast settlements, and took possession of the frontier. In the fertile valley of the Mohawk, the rich, rolling

Emigration to America.

[1] Craighead: Scotch and Irish Seeds in American Soil, p. 274.
[2] Ibid., p. 266.
[3] Froude: History of Ireland, vol. i. p 129.
[4] Hodge: History of the Presbyterian Church, p. 51.

land of the Susquehanna, the long, trough-like valleys which lie among the eastern ranges of the Alleghanies, in the uplands of Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas, they established their homes. They were a profoundly religious people. With a spirit like, and yet unlike, the Puritan settlers of New England, they have left their impress indelibly upon American religion. The uppermost feeling in their minds, when they came, was hatred of Episcopacy, whether in its Romish or its English guise. Their fathers had challenged it to mortal combat a century before, and in their own time the battle had gone against them. In the early years of the last century there were Scotch Presbyterians living here whose ears had been cut off by "Kirke's lambs;" whose fathers had been hung before their eyes for attending conventicles; who had worn the boot and thumbkins while Leslie stood by and jeered; who had been hunted away from their burning homes by that polished gentleman and stanch Churchman, John Graham, of Claverhouse; ministers who had been browbeaten by Irish bishops, and denied sympathy even by the gentle Jeremy Taylor,[1] had been turned out of their livings, fined, imprisoned, their ministerial office derided, the children of the marriages they celebrated pronounced bastards. A deep and sullen hatred of the Church which they regarded as the author of their wrongs was part of the furniture which they brought here with them. They were not likely to consider that they themselves were animated by a similar spirit, and, the opportunity being given, would have reversed the

Hostility to the Church.

[1] Craighead: p. 225.

parts in the tragedy. In point of fact, the opportunity had not been given, and so things were as they were. The sober judgment of the world is now made up that the Church lost far more than she won by the methods then adopted. The fair-minded and candid Hallam well says, "It was very possible that Episcopacy was of divine institution, but for this institution houses had been burned and fields laid waste, the gospel had been preached in the fields, and its ministers shot at their prayers. It was a religion of the boot and thumbscrew, which a good man must be very cold-blooded indeed if he did not hate and reject from the hands which offered it. For, after all, it is much more certain that God abhors cruelty and persecution than it is that He has set up bishops to have a superiority over presbyters." [1]

A cordon round the Church.

At the end of the period now before us,[2] the Scotch-Irish had established a cordon in the rear of the Church, whose seat was on the seaboard, reaching from Londonderry in New Hampshire, and following the foot-hills of the Alleghanies, to Georgia. They gave the religious tone to the life which was preparing to start with leaps and bounds across the mighty West. They made the first inroads into the wilderness "over the mountains." They planted in the new settlements the seed of hostility, or, at the best, dislike of the Church and her ways. They repaid with interest the grudge they owed her for her part in their fathers' quarrel.

But at the same time they became, unwittingly, her

[1] Constitutional History, vol. iii. p. 435.
[2] From 1700 to the War of Independence.

bulwark against the savage Indians and the Roman Catholic French. In the long and bloody French wars they bore the brunt. Behind the rampart they formed, the Church pursued her course in peace. When she had grown strong enough, in the next century, she moved out side by side with her ancient enemies, whose hostility had then abated, to possess the land of the West. For a while the Presbyterians stood sturdily with the Church against the enthusiasm of the "Great Awakening," and for the high Church and Sacramentarian ideas they had brought with them,[1] but in the end they succumbed to its influence.[2] From them rather than from the Puritans have come, for example, the popular judgment as to the proper observance of the Lord's Day, and the attitude of the individual Christian towards amusements and recreations. These notions have, in turn, unconsciously and unavoidably affected the practice of Church people in these regards.[3] The Church has caught from them also a certain seriousness of religious life and carefulness of personal conduct, for which she owes a debt. On the other hand, this debt has been more than repaid by the company of recruits which they have constantly furnished to her membership. Bishops, priests, and laymen, the roll of whose names would fill a book, have come to the Episcopal Church from conviction of her better ways, who have never lost their kind good-will to their old Presbyterian home.

Influence upon the Church.

[1] The definitions of the Sacraments in the "Confession of Faith" are such as would satisfy the very highest Churchman.

[2] Briggs: American Presbyterianism, pp. 249, 250, 252.

[3] Canon XIV., 1789.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE METHODISTS.

We come now to notice the first of American born sects. Heretofore the successive waves of immigration which we have traced, each carried its own type of religion, and threw it down as a deposit. These successive deposits constitute the primary ecclesiastical stratification of American life. Methodism shows itself not as an additional stratum, but as a great geological "fault" or break. As a sect it was organized and began its independent life here. Its growth and spread has probably been more rapid than that of any religious organization within the Christian era. It was launched from the deck of the Church of England. In its first stages its growth was from those who had always called themselves the Church's members. It was built, equipped, and manned by the Church's officers and crew. When it parted from her it bore away a multitude of her company. Methodism began its course in America at precisely that juncture when Episcopacy was at its lowest point, both in efficiency and in the good-will of the people; at the time when the Church's hands were tied most rigidly by the bonds which bound her to the English state. While she was fettered and impotent, Methodism came, "a system energetic, migratory, itinerant, extem-

The first American sect.

pore, like the population itself," [1] fitted itself at once to the new condition of things, and started immediately upon its extraordinary growth.

What, then, was Methodism? What is it? How has it affected the Church in America?

To answer the first of these questions, as in the case of Quakerism, the life and spirit of its founder must be examined.

Its origin.

In 1729 thoughtful men in England were seriously alarmed at what seemed likely to prove a permanent eclipse of faith.[2] It appeared as though the power of evil were about to triumph. The light of the Reformation, as they looked back upon it, seemed to them to have been only the flaring up of the torch before going out into darkness. Here and there the godly men who saw the evil of the day drew together in little groups to plan and pray for better things. These little societies were jeered at as "Holy Clubs," "Sacramentarians," the "righteous." [3] Such a club existed at Oxford. Half a dozen fellows and undergraduates composed it. Its leading spirits were Charles and John Wesley, two clergymen of the Church of England. The purpose of the club was the revival of spiritual life in the Church. To this end they observed with the utmost punctiliousness all the Church's rules and precepts. They were all Ritualists.[4] They were cir-

Methodists the first "Ritualists."

[1] Stevens: History of American Methodism, p. 22.

[2] Churchman's Life of Wesley, p. 14.

[3] Ib. p. 15.

[4] "The Oxford Methodists, up to the time of their general dispersion, were al. Church of England Ritualists." Tyerman: The Oxford Methodists, p. 5.

cumspect in life, studious, charitable, earnest-minded. Every morning and evening they spent an hour in private prayer. They communicated at Christ Church once a week. Every Wednesday and Friday they fasted till three o'clock.[1] They believed and taught the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist; used the mixed chalice; the eastward position; held to apostolic succession; baptism by immersion; prayers for the dead; and something which looked like invocation of Saints. They dreamed of a revival of the primitive Church as it was in the days of the fathers. For their punctiliousness they were dubbed "Methodists." The masterful character of John Wesley quickly came to dominate the others. Except for his connection with this Church revival it would probably have been forgotten long ago. The ecclesiasticism of it left its impress upon one side of Wesley's character which it retained all his life; but his following attached itself to him upon another side, which was later to be developed.

The Wesleys in Georgia.

When Oglethorpe had marshalled his motley colony for Georgia, he secured Charles Wesley for its chaplain. His brother John determined to go along as a missionary to the Indians in the neighborhood of the new plantation. He was commissioned by the S. P. G. for the work. The expedition to which he was attached landed at Savannah in 1736. The work among the Indians was quickly found to be impracticable, and no serious effort seems to have been made to pursue it. In its default, Wesley became the minister in charge of Christ Church, Savannah.

[1] Tyerman: The Oxford Methodists, pp. vi, 66.

There he began at once to carry into practice his pronounced ideas of church order and discipline. He multiplied services; emphasized the fast and feast days of the Church; refused to allow parents to stand, and insisted that none but communicants could be sponsors; insisted upon baptism by immersion as being the primitive mode; repelled from the Holy Communion all who had not been baptized by an episcopally ordained minister; insisted upon making priestly inquisition into the lives of all who offered to come to the Lord's Table. No place more ill adapted to his rubrical rigor could have been found than the Georgia colony was. He quickly estranged his people by his malapropos zeal. From estrangement, the feeling against him soon passed into active hostility. This was carried to its summit by Wesley's folly in connection with a young woman of his parish. He became enamoured of a Miss Hopke, declared his love, was kindly received, and believed that Miss Hopke had promised to marry him. She, however, thought differently, and married another man. Wesley, instead of pocketing his chagrin like a man, chose to bear himself in the matter like a priest. If he was not the young lady's husband, he was at any rate her spiritual pastor and master. In this latter capacity he determined to discipline her for the affront which she had put upon him as a man. He excommunicated her for the double-dealing which he alleged and believed she had been guilty of in the affair. His conduct in the premises was more than the Savannah people, already irritated against him, could endure.

John Wesley and Miss Hopke.

Miss Hopke's uncle, Mr. Causten, a rich and prominent citizen, and a hot-tempered and vindictive man, took up her quarrel, and led the popular anger against Wesley. The storm was too fierce to stand against. Wesley was compelled to flee. In company with a single friend, he escaped through the swamps, lost his way, lay down exhausted, was resuscitated by the exhibition of a piece of gingerbread which his friend had fortunately carried with him, made his way, more dead than alive, to Beaufort, and sailed away to England.

On his way out to Georgia there had chanced to be a little band of Moravians on the same ship with him. Wesley had been deeply impressed with the manner and spirit of their religious life. They had seemed to possess a secret of spiritual peace which he had not. They invited him, if ever he should have the opportunity, to visit the home of their Church at Hernhutt. When he went back to England, having failed to do his work among the Indians, and more than failed with the Savannah whites, disappointed and discredited, he made the intended visit. He found the Moravians to be of his spiritual kin. They recommended him to the friendship of one of their own members, Peter Böhler, then living in London. The mystical, Moravian idea that the religious life is in its essence the consciousness of God's presence in the soul, was not unfamiliar to Wesley. He had striven to realize this communion through Sacraments and observances while he belonged to the "Holy Club." His intimate association with that nonjuring Churchman, William Law, had fixed the

Wesley and the Moravians.

same idea deeper in his mind.[1] But through his intercourse with Böhler[2] he was led to that great experience which is the key not only to Wesley's work and character, but also to that great fabric which he builded.

Wesley's "conversion."

He records that on the 24th of May, 1738, while reading Luther's Introduction to the Romans, he was suddenly "converted." He had been for more than a dozen years a priest and preacher, a missionary and a pastor, but, according to the judgment which he ever afterward adhered to, he had never been a Christian. The absolute necessity of conscious "conversion" became from that time the centre of his system. "By it," he says, "I mean an inward impression of the soul whereby the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God."[3] He was not the first who believed and taught the same thing, but he was the first who had the power of sustained enthusiasm, the faculty of managing men, the genius for organization, which were able to build up about this central tenet a mighty ecclesiastical empire.

The condition of society which he confronted was one which would have appalled a man not sustained by a profound belief in God's presence with him.

Desperate condition of religion in England.

At the middle of the eighteenth century, England touched, probably, the lowest moral and religious point in her history. During more than a century she had been steadily drained of her most

[1] Tyerman: Life of Wesley, vol. i. p. 88.
[2] Stevens: History of American Methodism, p. 27.
[3] Ib. p. 192.

vigorous life. The Puritan emigration had carried away tens of thousands of her children whose religion, if hard and gloomy, was at any rate real. The deportation of the Quakers had emptied England of enthusiasm. The old Elizabethan Churchmanship was withdrawn into the secluded haunts of the nonjurors. The most virile and wholesome of her children had long since gone to the New World. What was left was inert, conventional, weak, helpless, like a depleted system, to resist the inroads of miasma. The miasma had already risen in the form of the cold and barren deism which then possessed the popular mind. Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke, Hume, and Tyndal were the teachers who had the public ear. The sordid, debauching reign of the Georges had been established, and its results had begun to show. The moralities, the very decencies of life, were forgotten. Blasphemy became the mark of a gentleman.[1] To "swear like a lord" was the height of the commoner's ambition. New and strange oaths showed a fertile wit. Gambling was the serious business of the court, and the unconcealed recreation of the people. Hogarth shows the fine gentleman meditating suicide after being ruined at play, and the street gamins playing at chuck-farthing on the flat tombstones of St. Paul's Churchyard. Gin was invented, and the street-signs announced unblushingly, that the passer-by could get "drunk for a penny, drunk, with clean straw, for twopence." The lubricity of the age matched its frivolity. Most of its literature is now, happily, un-

Deism.

Lubricity.

[1] Hore: Eighteen Centuries of the Church in England, p. 455.

readable. Fielding, Smollett, and Sterne have not been able even by their genius to rescue it from its dirt. In a literature where Tom Jones, Peregrine Pickle, Roderick Random, and Tristram Shandy are the best, what must the worst be? Montesquieu says of the English of that day, "They have no religion." The age's own judgment of itself appears in the proposal of a parliamentary bill, offered half in jest and wholly in earnest, "that the word *not* should be struck out where it occurs in the Commandments, and inserted in the Creeds!"

Ecclesiastical abuses.

Church abuses kept pace with civil ones. A few rich and favored clergy monopolized the livings, and left the mass of the clergy to eke out a miserable livelihood by questionable services to godless patrons,[1] or as "Fleet parsons."[2] The clergy were held in popular contempt, and were content to be so.[3] A mitre was schemed for, bribed for, begged for, without sense of shame.[4] When obtained it was prized for the earthly honor it brought, and not for the duty it entailed. Bishops visited their dioceses when it comported with their more serious duties at court. A Welsh bishop who held his see for years never saw it in his life. Confirmations, infrequently held, brought together the young people from miles around for a debauch. Thackeray violates no probabilities when he presents the Bishop of Bath and Wells bowing and smirking in the

[1] Abbey and Overton: Church of England in the Eighteenth Century, vol. ii. p. 16.
[2] Ib. ii. p. 19.
[3] Ib. ii. p. 20.
[4] Ib. ii. p. 26.

pump-room before the painted, patched, and powdered old Duchess of Yarmouth, the king's mistress.[1] What was not probable in a church in which the man who "wept over a dead donkey and left his own mother to starve," received preferment for his "Sentimental Traveller"? The Church in that century had great men, great scholars, great bishops, but they pursued their work and lived their lives apart from the people. Warburton, Wake, Bull, Butler, Waterland, and Sherlock have left their mark upon the generations since, but failed to redeem the one in which they lived.[2] This was the England which the newly converted Wesley and his co-worker Whitefield confronted. What could be done with it? How could it be brought to a sense of God and to righteousness of life?

The Methodists' purpose.

The purpose they set before themselves was a simple one. It was not to introduce any machinery of moral education or scheme of reformation, but to bring each individual soul into conscious intercourse with God. No project was ever conceived which appeared more Quixotic. But they set about the task, and measurably accomplished it. They began with the most unpromising. They preached to the drunkards, swearers, and harlots of Drury Lane, to the brutalized tin-miners of Cornwall, to the keelmen at Newcastle, to the begrimed colliers in Kingswood and Staffordshire. About Whitefield especially the people crowded by the thousand. Five, ten, twenty, thirty thousand people in

Whitefield the preacher, and Wesley the organizer.

[1] The Virginians.
[2] Abbey and Overton: vol. ii. p. 54.

a single congregation listened to his marvellous voice. He preached all afternoon, and the people refused to disperse when darkness fell. A friend "held a torch beside him, so that he could see his Bible, and he preached all night; when day broke, ten thousand people were standing and kneeling about him." The "converted" were quickly numbered by the thousand. Charles Wesley, the sweet singer, set their deep emotions to hymns. John Wesley, the born organizer and administrator, gathered together the isolated individuals, set them in "classes," set over each class a "leader," selected earnest and fluent men, and sent them out to travel over "circuits," as Wickliff had done centuries before with his "poor preachers." He at once became the head and centre of the movement, and remained so till it broke out of his hands in America.

It spread in his own lifetime to Scotland, Ireland, the West Indies, France, and to America.

Why did not the Church, to which all the Methodist leaders belonged, take it up and thank God for it? This question has been often asked. The answer is to be found in its central principle of conscious conversion. No bishop or priest could join in the Methodist movement without either openly declaring that he had had the emotional experience demanded as a condition precedent, — a declaration which the majority of Christian men cannot honestly make, — or else openly confessing that he had till that time been outside of the very kingdom of God, — a confession which still fewer will admit.[1]

[1] The whole attitude of the Church towards Methodism is set out with most admirable candor and intelligence by Abbey: English Church and Bishops in the Eighteenth Century, vol. i. pp. 288–291.

The movement reached America in 1767. In that year the first Methodist society was collected in New York.[1] The "Great Awakening," which was then at its greatest activity, had prepared the way for it. Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley were at one as to the nature of personal religion; but Edwards was a philosopher, while Wesley was pre-eminently an organizer and a man of affairs. His Methodist machinery took up and moulded the converts of the Edwards movement.

Came to America.

But Methodism had a relation to Episcopacy which the "Great Awakening" had not. Whitefield, who represented Wesley here, was a priest of the Church. Those whom he baptized were made thereby members of the Church of England. The Methodist societies used the Book of Common Prayer in their services, and their people all looked to the Church for the administration of the Sacraments.[2] Up to this point Methodism was simply a society within the Church. If the Church here had been organized, and possessed bishops who could have ordained ministers fast enough to keep pace with the rapidly multiplying Methodist societies, they would in all probability have remained within her boundaries. Wesley besought Lowth, Bishop of London, to ordain at least two priests who could administer the Sacraments to American Methodists. It is doubtful if any single action of a bishop has ever been more fruitful for evil than his refusal. At the opening of the Revolutionary

Methodists still within the Church.

[1] McMaster: History of the People of United States, vol. i. p. 56.
[2] Stevens: History of American Methodism, p. 75.

War the Wesleyans had increased to "more than eighty travelling preachers, many local preachers, hundreds of class leaders and exhorters, thousands of members, and ten thousands of regular hearers." [1] These all considered themselves to be within the Church, and were so considered both by Wesley and the clergy here.[2] But the great spreading branch grew too heavy to be sustained by the slender stem of the American Church. When Wesley despaired of securing clergy from the Bishop of London, in whose jurisdiction the American Methodists were, he sent Coke and Asbury to take over-sight of them as "superintendents." When they came they saw the situation more clearly than their patriarch could see it from beyond the sea. He had constructed a Frankenstein machine, which he was not able single-handed to control. The superintendents were not restrained by the same high Churchmanship which Wesley had always retained side by side with his enthusiasm. They assumed the functions and titles of bishops, organized the scattered societies into the compact empire which Methodism still is, cut the strained ligature which bound it to the Church, started the new sect upon its independent way, and made a new rent in the garment of the Lord. They led out of the Church in America probably one hundred thousand souls. Wesley sat at home and sent out adjurations and anathemas after his recreant superintendents, but it was too late. Their action was irretrievable. By his laying the whole weight of the

The Methodist "bishops."

[1] Stevens: p. 181.
[2] Ib. p. 75.

Christian system upon a single point, he had destroyed the "proportion of the Faith." The portion of the Church which depended from that point broke away by its own weight.

The loss has been unspeakable to both sections. The Church in America lost the most active part of its membership at the very time when it was about to need them most. Methodism lost the balanced order, the ethical strenuousness, the broad liberality and wholesome reasonableness, which have through good and evil been the possession of the Church.

The loss by separation.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE EPISCOPATE.

STRICTLY speaking, the Episcopal Church was not present in America as an organized body until after the Revolutionary War. Previous to that time, according to the generally accepted definition, there was here only the material out of which it was afterward to be constructed.

Two fundamentally different theories concerning the nature of the Church are now extant.

Two theories of the Church.

The *first* is the one which is generally entertained in the United States. To a large majority of persons it seems so palpably true and reasonable that its opposite appears grotesque. It is that a church, like a state, is built up from below. The materials from which it is constructed are separate individuals, who have given in their adhesion to Jesus Christ by an avowed act of faith. Having established their Christianity as individuals, each independently of the other, they draw together because they are like-minded, and band themselves into a society which becomes a Church. It is open to them to constitute this society in whatever fashion they see fit. The Holy Scriptures are conceived to be silent upon the whole question of organization, presumably with the intention of leaving men free to follow their own judgments here. The

whole power of ecclesiastical government rests upon the consent of the governed. It is a question of votes. By a consensus of opinion and action such a society may make such regulations as it chooses; may be monarchical, republican, or absolute; may ordain such and such kinds of officers as it may determine; may call its officers by any name and may assign to them any duties it will; and may remove and depose them at pleasure. The individuals may construct such an ecclesiastical machine as they think will be most efficient, and then may reasonably expect that the Holy Spirit will lodge in it as its motive power. This is the popular notion and the one generally accepted by Protestantism.

The *other* theory is that the Church is organized from the summit downward; that the authority which pertains to it, and the grace which flows through it, are things which do not depend upon the votes of its units; that men do not establish their Christianity as isolated souls, but that the Church is concerned even in the original transaction by the individual.[1] They who hold to this theory conceive that the essential features of the Church's structure have been long since settled. Whether they might not be changed under the stress of an absolute necessity, is a question they do not seriously ask. They wait for such a demonstrable necessity to appear, and assert that it never yet has appeared. They declare that "it is evident to all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, — Bishops, Priests,

[1] "It [the Holy Spirit] was given corporately, so that they who received it realized at once a unity which preceded any individual action of their own."—Lux Mundi. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co., 1890, p. 373.

and Deacons."[1] While they do not assert that this arrangement is the result of a categorical command of God, still they hold it to be of so potent obligation that it may not be changed except for weightier reasons than have ever yet appeared. This conception of the Church is of the essence of Episcopacy. Overwhelmed as it is by popular vote in the United States, it still is the belief held and acted upon by five-sixths of the Christian world.

Practical disadvantage of the Church's theory.

Its acceptance by the members of the English Church in colonial times, put them at an incalculable disadvantage as compared with their fellow-colonists. The Church was here, as Richard complained that he had been sent into the world, "scarce half made up." An Episcopal Church without a Bishop is as a body without a head. The scattered parishes were as the beads of a rosary in which the string is cut, leaving the cross, which should be pendent, to fall helpless upon the ground. At the first settlement of the country the then Bishop of London had chanced to be a stockholder and a member of council in the "Virginia Company." This fact gave him a vague, advisory oversight of its affairs. His successors for nearly a century followed his example until it became a prescriptive right of that see. Bishop Compton in 1703 had it confirmed to him and his successors by an "Order in Council."[2] But the supervision which the Bishop of London could give to churches farther away than the heart of Australia now is, was worth but little.

[1] Prayer-Book: Preface to Ordinal.
[2] Abbey: English Church and its Bishops, vol. i. p. 82.

No order could be guaranteed. Discipline could not be maintained. Confirmation was a physical impossibility. But it was in regard to ordination that the evil of the situation made itself most keenly felt. Other churches were here with their complete equipment. When a sufficient number of Presbyterians found themselves living together in a remote settlement, they chose a man for pastor, and at the most he need not leave the colony to find a Presbytery in session who could lay hands on him. If they were Baptists or Independents they chose a man, and either invited two or three neighboring ministers to join with them, or, in default of that, ordained him themselves. When a Quaker meeting grew too large it swarmed like a hive of bees, and the younger swarm set up for itself. The Roman Catholics and the Churchmen were helpless. For a hundred and seventy-five years the Church in America was a Japhet in search of a father. The chapter now before us is the story of the long, wearisome, pitiful, despairing effort to obtain that office without which the Church could not live.

Ordination and discipline.

As early as 1638 Archbishop Laud had a plan[1] to send out a bishop to New England who might keep as tight a hand over the Puritans there as he was doing over their brethren at home. But the triumph of Parliament, the overthrow of the king, and the loss of his own head prevented his carrying it into effect.

Early efforts to obtain the Episcopate.

During the Commonwealth, of course, nothing could be expected in the colonies from a Church that was at its last gasp at home.

[1] Hawkins: Historical Notices, London, 1845, p. 376.

After the Restoration the Lord Chancellor Clarendon[1] undertook a similar project in Virginia, but a change of ministry and the indifference of the dissolute king brought it to naught.

Tenison and Secker, Archbishops of Canterbury, and Compton, Bishop of London, labored often and vainly to secure the same end.

From this side of the water the cry for a bishop was never silent. We have already noticed the scheme proposed by Chaplain Miller at the time of the English capture of New York. So far as any difficulty from this side was concerned, his plan was entirely feasible. It was to set aside "the king's farm" in New York, for the support of a suffragan of the Bishop of London, who should have jurisdiction in all America.

So soon as the first hardships of settlement were past and the Church really began to grow, the need became imperative.

The need of it patent.

When Keith and Talbot, the first missionaries of the S. P. G., had completed the tour of investigation which their instructions made their duty, they reported that the primary need was bishops. Talbot writes to the Society, in 1702,[2] "I don't doubt that some good man with one hundred pounds a year would do the Church more service than with a coach and six a hundred years hence." Two years later he wrote to his friend Keith, "Mr. John Lillingston designs, it seems, to go to England next year. He seems to be the fittest person that America affords for the

[1] Hawkins: Historical Notices, p. 376.
[2] MSS. Letters, vol. xi. p. 335.

office of a suffragan. Several of the clergy, both of this province and of Maryland, have said they would pay their tenths to him as the vice-gerent of my Lord of London, whereby the Bishop of America might have as honorable provision as some in Europe."

In a letter to the secretary of the S. P. G., he speaks with great plainness, urging sharply that when the Apostles heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent Peter and John that they might receive the Holy Ghost, not standing upon any question of salary; that when they heard the Word was preached at Antioch they sent there Paul and Barnabas; that when Paul did only *dream* that a man wanted him in Macedonia, he went all so fast; — "but here we have been calling these so many years, and you will not hear, or will not answer, which is the same thing." He does not undertake to prophesy, but there is such a thing as the kingdom "being taken away from them who will not use it, and given to them who will!"

Great opportunities lost.

A convocation of fourteen clergymen at Burlington, N. J., in 1705, signed a petition to the Archbishop, representing that many Lutheran and Independent Ministers were ready to conform if a Bishop were here to ordain them.[1]

In 1709 the officers of the S. P. G. presented a memorial to Queen Anne begging that a colonial bishopric might be endowed out of the proceeds of the lands ceded by the Council of Utrecht,[2] but the death of the queen put an end to the project.

[1] MSS. Letters, vol. xi. p. 335.

[2] Abbey: English Church and Bishops, vol. i. p. 87. Beardsley: Life of Johnson, p. 15.

The same year, Governor Nicholson of Maryland wrote the Archbishop of Canterbury that "unless bishops can be had, the Church will surely decline."

The S. P. G.'s plan.

In 1715, the S. P. G. laid before George I. a well-digested scheme for the same purpose. It was proposed that four bishops should be consecrated, one for Barbadoes, one for Jamaica, one to have his seat at Burlington, N. J., and another at Williamsburg, Va. The Northern Diocese was to include all the settlements east of the Delaware, extending to Newfoundland; the Southern Diocese having all west of the Delaware, and reaching to the Spanish possessions. They represented that the college at Williamsburg would provide a place for the one, and that they had purchased, for six hundred pounds, a house and grounds at Burlington for the other. Just then the Scotch rebellion broke out, and the High Church clergy showed so much sympathy for the Stuart line that the King and his minister, Walpole, would hear nothing further about the Church's affairs.[1] With a lingering hope in the ultimate fulfilment of the plan, Bishop Tenison left one thousand pounds in his will for the American part of it.

The Pennsylvania plan.

In 1765 a still more promising plan was devised on this side of the sea. In southern Pennsylvania there were rich manors which had been reserved for the Duke of York. They were not occupied by anybody who could show good title. In the Delaware River were also sundry islands, occupied in part by squatters, but which were not included in Penn's grant. These together would provide ample

[1] MSS. Letters, vol. x. p. 28.

endowment for a bishopric, and their resumption for that purpose would disturb no equities.[1] Nothing came of it.

Nothing came of the petition in which the clergy of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York all joined.[2] Nothing came of the appeals of Cutler and Johnson, and the Commissaries, and fifty others who pleaded for the Episcopate. They represented with truth that for the lack of it the Church was falling into disorder and disgrace; that dissenting ministers in plenty were ready to conform, but were not willing to cross the sea for ordination; that of those who had crossed, one-fourth, by actual count, had been lost at sea, captured by pirates, shipwrecked, or died of smallpox in England. But their prayers, joined with those of the officers of the S. P. G., of Tenison, Compton, and Secker, had been fruitless, — and why? Why was an action apparently so easily done, so desired by the parties concerned, and so essential to the Church's welfare, persistently refused?

Reasons of the failure.

The fundamental reason was that same entanglement of Church with State which had nearly choked out all spiritual life. The Church of England, paralyzed by this fatal alliance, had lost the power not only to act but even to think for herself. But even if she had had the power to do her duty to her far-away children, she, for the most part, had neither the knowledge nor the good-will requisite. British ignorance of American affairs is even now a standing jest. That

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Pa. p. 373.
[2] Smith: Life of Dr. William Smith, vol. i. p. 270.

density which cannot perceive an American witticism, which looks for buffalo about the suburbs of New York and wild Indians in the streets of Chicago, two hundred years ago was still more hopeless. The English piqued themselves upon their ignorance and indifference. A few bishops and agents of the S. P. G., and the vulgar merchants of the City, were fairly well informed; but, as a rule, the people gave no thought to the plantations. Especially were they indifferent to matters pertaining to the Church.[1] That sense of personal responsibility for the progress of the body, which marks the membership of a voluntary Church, is not to be expected in an Establishment. In it it is the business of the official class to make plans and execute them. Could Englishmen have realized at all the mighty destiny of the then neglected colonies, they would, of course, have acted differently towards them; but this sort of knowledge is too much to expect of any generation. As the feeling then was, the suggestion of a bishop for the colonies seemed to the ordinary mind the most grotesque of incongruities. It was as though a serious proposal had been made to send a sword of state to the King of the Cannibal Islands, or a coach and six to Prester John. The current conceptions of what a bishop was, and what a "plantation" was, were two notions which would not fit together. A bishop was a dignitary, a peer, a being of exalted state, as much for show as for use, but indispensable to the right constitution of things,—in England. The modern idea of an Apostolic Bishop was not

The current conception of the Episcopal office.

[1] White: Memoirs, New York, 1880, p. 75.

thinkable. Such a creature had not been seen for so many centuries that his memory had faded out. They were not capable of imagining a bishop who had no connection with the State, no artificial dignity, simply an Apostolic man, going about like Selwyn or Chase, in the humblest guise, without state or ceremonial or guaranteed livelihood even, mindful of his work for Christ and His Church. The officer which the American Church asked was an official which the English Churchmen could not then picture to themselves.

To this difficulty of the understanding, the moral darkness of the eighteenth century added a difficulty of spirit. The great men of the Church were writing books; the little men were scheming for preferment; the mass was careless of the whole matter.[1] Besides this there was the long-continued feeling of distrust of Churchmen, entertained by the civil power.[2] To the secular official's way of thinking, there were too many bishops already. "Priestcraft" was one of the cries of the day. No action would be permitted, if politicians could help it, which would even seem to be in the interest of the sacerdotal order.

These were the obstacles in the mother country, — ignorance, indifference, prejudice, political entanglements, and secular jealousies. By the time they were in the way of being overcome, a dangerous opposition to Episcopacy had developed in the colonies themselves.[3]

Fear of the office in the colonies.

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Mass. p. 675.

[1] Abbey and Overton: English Church in Eighteenth Century, vol. i. pp. 39, 40.

[2] Abbey: English Church and its Bishops, vol. i. pp. 35, 36.

[3] Baird: Religion in America, p. 182.

The idea of an ultimate separation from England, or, rather, of securing a home rule for the colonies, began to be entertained at a much earlier date than is generally supposed.[1] Indeed it was present to some minds from the very first. It was openly charged against the colonies, during the long contests over their charters, that their purpose was to break away entirely from English authority. It cannot be said that this was their purpose in the way of being before their minds in the shape of a definite design; but it was in the form of a dream which many loved to entertain. In truth the war for independence became a future certainty the day the first permanent settlement was made. The necessity was in the situation. Some saw it early; some saw it clearly; but all felt it instinctively. Out of this instinct arose the strenuous opposition which the great body of colonists showed to the introduction of the Episcopate. It commenced to manifest itself as soon as the dream of ultimate separation began to be clearly defined, and continued until separation became a fact, when it suddenly ceased.

Early thought of separation.

The ground of the opposition was twofold, political and ecclesiastical. In form the long controversy was a discussion concerning the right and scriptural organization of the Church; but in spirit it was a political contest. "The whole body of the Puritans were determined to resist the introduction of bishops into America. They feared lest these might use all the authority of

[1] Sabine: Loyalists of the American Revolution, vol. i. p. 65.
[1] Abbey: English Church and Bishops, vol. i. p. 88.
[1] Caswall: The American Church and the American Union, p. 73.

the Crown to destroy Puritanism and establish Prelacy."[1] The primary objection to bishops was that they were officers of the Crown; opposition to them as being officials unknown to Scripture and the primitive Church was an after-thought. No question was discussed in colonial times which so seriously enlisted the interest of the people as did this one. The controversy raged intermittently for seventy years. Checkly, Johnson, Beach, Apthorp, and Chandler maintained the Church's side.[2] They were answered by Dickinson, Mayhew, Chauncey, and a hundred others, from the Dissenters' standpoint. Pamphlets, broadsides, letters, newspaper skits, "Questions Stated," "Replies to Questions Stated," and "Answers to Replies to Questions Stated," kept the printers busy for years.

It is much the custom for Church writers to assume that the opposition to the Episcopate was but the outcome of the wanton and gratuitous enmity of those who hated the Church. Both charity and fact condemn this assumption. The situation being what it then was, there was good and substantial ground for opposition.

The legal status of the colonies.

The fundamental political question which was opened when the original charters were withdrawn, and which remained open till the Revolution, was: What is the legal *status* of the colonies?[3] Were they an integral part of the kingdom?

[1] Briggs: American Presbyterianism, p. 143.
[2] White: Memoirs, p. 73.
[3] Smith: History of New York, pp. 220–228.
[3] Sabine: Loyalists of the Revolution, vol. i. p. 24.
[3] McMaster: History of the United States, vol. i. p. 33.

Or did their charters give them an autonomy? These two contentions were the opposite poles of the dispute. If the former were the true principle, then English law and custom were of obligation at every point where they were not estopped by the distinct provision of a charter. Now the Church Establishment was part and parcel of the English law. It was seriously contended that it was *ipso facto* established here also; "that the constitutional laws of the mother country, antecedent to the legislatures of our own, are binding upon us; and therefore at the planting of the colony the English religious Establishment immediately took place; *secondly*, that the Act which established the Episcopal Church in South Britain, previous to the union of England and Scotland, extended to and equally affected all the colonies."[1] If this contention of Churchmen were well founded, then bishops, if they came here at all, would come with the whole power of English law behind them. No matter what assurances they might give that they had only spiritual purposes in view, they would still be invested with secular powers which they could not renounce if they wanted to; and human nature being what it is, they could not be trusted to confine themselves to spiritual weapons while they would have such potent secular ones ready to hand.

John Adams's opinion.

"If Parliament can tax us," says John Adams, "they can establish the Church of England with all its creeds, articles, tests, ceremonies, and tithes, and prohibit all other Churches as conventicles and schism shops."[2] Adams was clearly right; at

[1] Smith: History of New York, p. 220.
[2] John Adams: Works, vol. x. p. 287.

any rate he expressed the honest belief of the great majority on both sides of the question. Dr. Chandler's sincerity is not to be questioned when he asserted that "the bishops proposed were to have no temporal power, no maintenance from the colonies, to be confined to the exercise of their spiritual functions only."[1] This was all very well, but who was to guarantee that the bishops, if they came, would take the same view of the case? And if they should take a different view, what, upon the Tory theory of the political status, was to hinder them from carrying it out to the discomfiture of dissenters? The Episcopal advocates themselves let out unconsciously that the bishop they had in mind was not just the meek and apostolic creature described. Every scheme proposed began with a "sufficient provision for his dignified maintenance." The power which he would be to allay political disaffection, is constantly dwelt upon in the letters of the Venerable Society's missionaries.[2] "The King is thoroughly sensible that the Episcopalians are his best friends."[3] The clergy here were careful to sustain this conviction of the King. The people generally knew this to be the case. They feared, and under the circumstances had reason to fear, the consequences which might flow from allowing the Church to set up her powerful machinery here in its entirety. This apprehension was not confined to dissenters or even Church laymen. In 1771, only twelve out of the one hundred clergy in Virginia joined in

Fear of the Episcopate well founded.

[1] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 73.
[2] Perry: Historical Collections, *passim*.
[3] Abbey: English Church and Bishops, vol. i. p. 364.

a petition to the Crown for an American bishop. A larger convention than the one which adopted the measure rejected it, and four of them sent their protest against it to the Virginia House of Burgesses, — almost all of which were Churchmen, — and received the formal thanks of the House for their patriotic action.[1] Few clergy indeed sympathized with these four, but the significant thing is that there were any such.

Bishops impossible till after the Revolution.

The truth would seem to be, that in the face of the dissenting opposition, the support which the opposition received from the dissenters and the colonial agents in England, the indifference of the American laity, the apathy of the English clergy, and the impotence of the bishops who moved in the matter, there was no time, from the opening of the eighteenth century till the close of the Revolution, when it would have been possible to have a bishop consecrated for America.[2]

This was the judgment to which the clergy themselves reluctantly came.[3] Some among them despaired entirely. Some began to turn their thoughts elsewhere — to the Swedish or Moravian Church. Not a few of the clergy in the Middle and Southern colonies entertained the idea of an "Independent Episcopal Church." Dr. Smith wrote to the Bishop of London in 1776, "The rest are a mixed sort, chiefly for an Independent Church of England — a strange sort of church indeed! But the notion gains too much ground here even among the clergy. I believe

Idea of an "Independent Church."

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 76.
[2] White: Memoirs, p. 75.
[3] Smith: Life of Dr. Smith, vol. i. p. 387.

your lordship will perceive something of this sort not altogether pleasing if the resolves of a majority of the last Jersey Convention come before you, against commissaries, and preferring thereto a kind of presbyterian or synodical self-delegated government by conventions." [1] This idea was developed by Dr. White of Philadelphia, in 1782, in his celebrated pamphlet, "The Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered." [2] Dr. White did not speak for himself alone, by any means, when he proposed his plan. His scheme assumed that the hope of obtaining the Episcopate from England had been demonstrated to be impossible, and had been abandoned. In that case there seemed to him to remain but the alternatives of permanent anarchy, or such an organization as could be made out of the materials present. He proposed that (*a*) the clergy and lay delegates from the parishes, in definite districts to be defined, should combine in an organization which might be called a Diocese or a Synod or what not; (*b*) that these organizations should, at the outset, record their attachment to Episcopacy, and their determination to secure it when God should open the way thereto; (*c*) that, meanwhile, the Church should proceed in presbyterial fashion, inasmuch as the Church contemplated would only possess presbyters. He justified his proposal by the plea of imperious necessity; and by the fact that the Church of England had never denied the validity of non-Episcopal orders, and had recognized them under a less exigent need.[3]

Dr. White's plan.

[1] Smith: Life of Dr. Smith, vol. i. p. 401.
[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Pa. p. 414.
[2] White: Memoirs, p. 99.
[3] White: Memoirs, p. 101, *note*.

The *popular* judgment concerning the matter was fairly stated by Benjamin Franklin, who expressed his amazement that devout and learned men who were fully qualified to instruct and pray for their neighbors should hesitate to do so without taking the pains to cross the sea for the purpose of securing "the permission of a cross old gentleman at Canterbury."[1]

The popular judgment.

But whatever might be the theories held as to the succedaneums proposed, the fact was patent that the question of the Episcopate was involved in the deeper question of the legal position of the colonies, and that that question could only be decided by the stern arbitrament of the sword.

[1] McMaster: History of the United States, vol. i. p. 232.

CHAPTER XVIII.

A SURVEY.

It is not easy to reproduce a picture of a past time, but it will be of interest to pause here to take a broad view of the condition of the Colonial Church at the period immediately preceding the War of Independence.

It had then extended from the chief towns and settlements on the seaboard, where it had first gained a lodgement, to the new places of the second rank. At the opening of the century it had been found only at such places as Boston, Newport, New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, and on the Virginia coast. Now there were parishes at Falmouth and Casco, besides the old one at Portsmouth; at Salem, Dedham, Marblehead, in Massachusetts; at Bristol, R. I., and New-England towns of a similar class. When New Hampshire, with its territorial appendage Vermont, had a Churchman for its governor at the middle of the century, it was determined to endow the Church from its public lands. A half-section in each township in Vermont was set apart for this purpose, but the people from whom the surveyors were taken being hostile, the sections were located in swamps, on mountain tops, and in the bottoms of lakes, so that but little else came of it than came of all similar attempts; that is, the ill-will

Spread of the Church.

of the people and small gain to the Church.[1] In Connecticut alone can it be said that striking success had been achieved. The drift toward the Church of England, which began with the President of Yale College and his colleagues, had steadily spread. The people came in in large numbers.[2] There was to be found there a native-born clergy, of a far higher character and education, and with more intelligent and pronounced views concerning the Church, than was the rule elsewhere. Even after the war, during which the Church had been torn to pieces and hundreds had moved away, there were still to be found twenty clergy and forty thousand Church people in that colony.[3] In it there had never been any of those impotent attempts at legal coercion which the Church essayed elsewhere. There was no bad blood, no memories of legal violence.

In Connecticut.

There was a fair parish at the Dutch town of Albany, little churches at Rye, Jamaica, Hempstead, and on Staten Island,[4] beside the strong and growing Church in New York. In that province the Episcopalians were reckoned at about one-fifteenth of the population.[5] Burlington, N. J., was one of the centres of Church life, and the seat of one of the proposed bishoprics. In Pennsylvania missions had pushed as far west as Lancaster, and even Carlisle, with the nucleus of a parish on the Juniata. In the South there had been a distinct retro-

In New York.

New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

[1] Caswall: American Church and American Union, p. 73.
[2] Beardsley: History of the Church in Connecticut, vol. i. *passim*.
[3] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 137.
[4] Smith: History of New York.
[4] Briggs: American Presbyterianism, p. 109.
[5] Smith: History of New York, p. 218.

gression.[1] Even in faithful old Virginia dissenters were two to one.[2] The results of the fatal breach between clergy and people had already appeared there. Religious indifference prevailed everywhere; churches were falling into neglect and ruin; many of the clergy had withdrawn; still more could have done so to advantage; the few faithful men who remained lamented and despaired.[3] Further south the condition was scarcely better. There were two churches in Charleston, — an increase of one in eighty years, — and six meeting-houses.[4] But the clergy of South Carolina were, as a rule, zealous men, and had the great advantage of being able generally to take the side of their people against England.[5]

Condition in the South.

All the parishes from Maine to Georgia belonged to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. Except in Virginia and Maryland the clergy were practically all missionaries of the "British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts."

The conversion of the native Indians, which had been so prominent in the early plans of the Church, had almost entirely failed and been abandoned. In the South, where the promise for this work had once been best, it had gradually died away as negro slavery became more and more firmly established. The low estimate of the intrinsic value of a human being, which slavery unconsciously creates, had operated to

Decay of Indian Missions.

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. pp. 141–143.
[2] Lodge: History of the Colonies, p. 57.
[3] Ib. p. 58.
[4] Ib. p. 176.
[5] Ib. p. 176.

put an end to missionary work among savages. In the North a struggling mission was still maintained among the Mohawks,[1] but it, too, was soon to be swept away by the imminent war. Speaking broadly, there cannot be said to have been any permanent work of any church effected among the Indians until they had become so surrounded and hemmed in by the white population that their restless savagery was to a degree restrained. The success was earliest and most marked among those tribes which were already partly civilized and fixed in their habitat when the whites first saw them.[2] At the period before us they had only just laid down the tomahawk and butcher-knife, which they had carried for so long at the instigation of the French, and were about to take them up again in the pay of the English. By the colonists they were feared and loathed as monsters compounded of wolf and fiend.

Sources of gain.

The Church growth was very unequal in different localities. The accession from Quakers in Pennsylvania, which had set in at a very early period, still continued. The reports of the missionaries in the outlying counties constantly record the baptism of these people and their children. The rapid growth in Connecticut has been already noticed. In New York and New Jersey the great gain was from the Dutch. The hereditary enmities which separated other Presbyterians from the Church did not operate among them. There had been differences, of course, but there was no deep-seated rancor on either hand. They deeply

1 Perry: History, vol. i. p. 333.
2 Parkman: Discovery of the Great West, p. 275.
2 Liggins: Value and Success of Foreign Missions, p. 157.

sympathized with the Church in one important particular; they also felt bound to cross the sea for ordination.[1] When a schism was effected among themselves upon this question, and an "American Dutch Church" was set up,[2] many of the dissatisfied on either hand came to the English Church. But the most active cause was the stolid tenacity with which they held on to the Dutch tongue in their public worship, long after their children and youth had ceased to be at home in it. These became restive and came numerously to the Church, where they could hear English spoken. When the elders did bring themselves to give up their Dutch, it was too late; their children had become Episcopalians.[3]

From the Dutch.

In Philadelphia the Dutch congregation offered to come over in a body if the Bishop of London would ordain their minister.

The Lutheran *Coetus* in Pennsylvania made the same proposition, and the Swedish Commissary offered to lead the movement, and to conduct the negotiations between the two Churches, in both of which his own ministry was recognized.[4] Had there been a bishop resident there is every reason to believe that a permanent coalescence might have been effected between both

[1] Gunn: Memoirs of Dr. Livingston, New York, 1829, pp. 92, 93.

[2] Ib. p. 94.

[3] A Mr. Livingston, a member of the Dutch Church, writes in 1770: "Had this been done thirty years ago the Dutch Congregation would have been much more numerous than it is now. The greatest part of the Episcopal Church consists of the accessions they have had from the Dutch Church." And he adds that though Dutch was his own mother tongue, he could not understand a sermon half so well in it as he could in English; and as for his children, "there was not one that understood a sentence in Dutch." Memoirs of Dr. Livingston, p. 108.

[4] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Pa., pp. 367, 396, 432.

these bodies and this Church, as could also have been done with the Methodists ten years later.

Lack of clergy.

The constant complaint of the time was that there were not enough clergy to go in and possess the places which offered. Young men thought twice before they ventured upon the dangers of shipwreck and smallpox, as well as the great expense, which were involved in a journey to England for ordination.[1]

With the meagre means at her hand the Church had done much in the way of education, but at the date before us was being left behind in this race by the other churches. The institutions now known as Columbia College and the University of Pennsylvania had both been established under Church auspices, and in both instances had for their primary object to increase the ministry.[2] They had clergymen for their organizers and first presidents, but as the political issue grew more clearly pronounced they passed more and more out from under Episcopal influence.

State of religion.

The Church life was affected, as it always is, by the prevailing moral habits of the age. Public and private morals never reached so low an ebb in the colonies as they did in the mother country; but still they were low enough. The Deism and its attendant loosening of moral sanctions, which dominated the popular life of England, affected America also. Tom Paine, the most effective writer on the Colonial side of the political issue, gained in that way

1 Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Pa., p. 434 *passim*.
2 Perry: History, vol. i. ch. xxxiii.

the popularity which made his cheap and taking infidelity spread among the people. It never ran into that superfluity of naughtiness which forms so strange a chapter in the history of modern England, but rather produced a low standard of righteousness, and a sordid manner of life.

Influence of Benjamin Franklin.

The typical man of his time was Benjamin Franklin. He had been longer known and exercised more influence in every department of life than any other man in America. Upon the moral and religious side this influence was wholly bad. His autobiography showed that the gross offences of his own early life were repented of, not because they had been sinful, but because they had been foolish. They were to be avoided by other young men, not because they were hateful to God and left stains upon the soul, but because they hindered earthly success. The mean and cautious maxims of Poor Richard "passed into the daily speech of the people, were quoted in sermons, were printed on the title-pages of pamphlets, and used as matter by the newspaper moralists of the day, and continued to be read with avidity even down to the Revolution." [1] They contain no high or noble motive. They are all the maxims of a selfish man, and all such as might be kept with ease by an impure man. They tended to dry up the springs of religion. As the thoughts of a man who was rather non-religious than irreligious, they fairly reflect the spirit of a non-religious age. Franklin was the representative man of his generation. Unquestionably great

[1] McMaster: Life of Benjamin Franklin, p. 113.

in science, in statesmanship, in diplomacy and affairs, he was utterly incapable of understanding things which the world has always deemed of prime importance. Nominally a Churchman, he poked fun at those who sought the Episcopate. A man of letters, he produced a paraphrase of the Book of Job which he considered to be better English than King James's translation,[1] and made a Prayer-Book[2] which could only be of use to such as had no sense of devotion. But his age was like him, and he had largely made it so, in its lack of spiritual earnestness.

It is difficult now to conceive how coarse and cruel life in America was a century ago. "Redemptioners"

[1] KING JAMES'S.

Verse 6. Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also amongst them.

7. And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord and said, From going to and fro in the earth and from walking up and down in it.

8. And the Lord said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil?

9. And Satan answered the Lord and said, Doth Job fear God for naught?

FRANKLIN.

Verse 6. And it being levee day in Heaven, all God's nobility came to court to present themselves before him; and Satan also appeared in the circle, as one of the ministry.

7. And God said unto Satan, You have been some time absent; where were you? And Satan answered, I have been at my country seat, and in different places visiting my friends.

8. And God said, Well, what think you of Lord Job? You see he is my best friend, a perfectly honest man, full of respect for me, and avoiding everything that might offend me.

9. And Satan answered, Does your majesty imagine that his good conduct is the effect of personal attachment and affection? — McMASTER: Benjamin Franklin, p. 87.

[2] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 243.

and apprentices went half clad, slept in garrets, ate cold meat in the kitchen, and were acquainted with the cudgel. The man who was unfortunate enough to owe a few dollars was sent to a gaol so vile that it cannot here be even described. Prisoners for debt and for crime were herded together as regardless of sex as if they had been so many beasts. Even in Connecticut, convicts were confined in an underground cave, reeking with filth, chained by the neck to iron bars. In Massachusetts ten crimes, and in Delaware twenty, were punishable by death. The whole machinery of reform and the administration of charity with which the Church is identified now, was wanting. Soldiers and sailors were flogged half to death for petty offences. The stocks, the pillory, and the whipping-post stood in the public square, and their victims were pelted by the rabble. A public hanging would draw a crowd from miles around. Women who had been convicted of larceny were carted down Broadway to the whipping-post, and received thirty-nine lashes each.[1] The year the Revolutionary War began, two men were burned at the stake at Poughkeepsie, for arson.[2] Within thirty years of the same date, men had been burned, hung alive in chains, and broken on the wheel, in New York.[3] Education was general among the better classes in the North, but in the South it was neither possessed nor desired. There, but few gentlemen were able to write an intelligent letter,[4] and the common people could neither read nor write at all.

Coarseness of the age.

[1] Lodge: History of English Colonies, p. 324.
[2] Ib. p. 324.
[3] Ib. p. 322.
[4] Ib. p. 75.

Social distinctions were sharply drawn. Rights of precedence were as strenuously insisted upon as at the French Court. The "quality" were clearly marked off from the common folk. In the New England meeting-houses it was still the custom to "dignify the congregation." Grave and discreet persons assigned pews to the families according to their standing and position. While this was not done formally in the parishes of the Church of England, it still was substantially. In point of fact, the Church was confined to the aristocracy either of education or of position. In New England it was the former, in the other colonies the latter.[1] It contained the frequenters of the provincial governor's mimic court, the county families in Virginia and Maryland, the collectors of the ports, the great merchants, the judges and lawyers, the refined, cultivated, and fashionable.

Social distinctions sharply drawn.

The church buildings — where they possessed any architectural style at all — were of the petty elaborateness of Sir Christopher Wren. Himself the son of a clergyman and the grandson of a bishop, he had set his mark upon church architecture, which it retained in America long after it had been outgrown in England. In a collected group of his English parish churches, one can see whence came the New-England meeting-house and the colonial church.[2]

Architecture.

The services were what would now be deemed intolerably bare, cold, and lifeless. The surplice was rarely used. There were probably not above a score in America.

[1] Perry: History, vol. i. p. 446.
[2] Geo. C. Mason, architect: in Lippincott's Magazine, Nov. 1885.

The "gown and bands" was the usual vestment. The "clerk," from his stall below the reading-desk, made the responses, and announced the hymns,[1] with the formula "Let us sing to the praise and glory of God." The congregation sat while singing;[2] when the custom of standing was introduced in 1814, it was considered a portentous ritual innovation, requiring action by the House of Bishops.[3] At the Prayers it was not the custom for any but communicants to kneel,[4] the others sitting in a respectful attitude. The Holy Communion was celebrated quarterly, or, in a very few places, monthly; and the proportion of communicants to the congregation was very small.

Church services.

Confirmation, of course, could not be had, and the nature and purpose of the rite had well-nigh been forgotten. Bishop White was never confirmed at all,[5] and it is doubtful if Bishop Seabury was.[6]

Confirmation.

[1] Ayres: Life of Dr. Muhlenberg, pp. 46, 47.

[2] White: Memoirs, p. 39.

[3] Perry: Half-Century of Legislation, p. 434.

[4] Ayres: Life of Dr. Muhlenberg, p. 25.

[5] Dr. Muhlenberg says: "We recollect distinctly Bishop White telling us that he had never been confirmed, and his adding, moreover, that the English bishops were not in the practice of confirming those who came over from this country for ordination." Ayres: Life of Dr. Muhlenberg, p. 50.

[6] Dr. Beardsley, whose opinion must always carry weight, insists strenuously that Bishop Seabury must have been confirmed, because of the stress he always laid upon the rite after he became a bishop himself. This *a priori* argument, however, hardly overcomes the facts: *first*, that there is no record of or allusion to his confirmation; and *second*, that the bishop who ordained him was the most unlikely of all to insist upon a neglected ordinance.

"Thomas of Lincoln is spoken of as a worthy man, but too fond of the company of people of rank, and sadly forgetful of his promises. He squinted terribly, and was very deaf; but his never-failing humor and facetiousness made him an amusing companion. George II. delighted in his society, and brought him over, with promises of promotion, from his chaplaincy in Hamburg." Abbey: English Church and its Bishops, vol. ii. p. 75.

A favorite mode of raising the money to build churches was by lotteries, which were conducted under State control.[1] The clergy were never spoken of as "priests," but always as clergymen or ministers, and, if the order was meant to be designated, as Presbyters or Deacons. Their stipends were, for the most part, painfully meagre. Probably there were not more than five which reached one hundred and fifty pounds a year. The minister at Lancaster, Pa., complains that he cannot possibly support himself and family of eleven persons on less than one hundred pounds annually.[2] To take away from such ill-paid clergy, in part, at least, their cruel anxiety for the future of their families, a society had been formed in 1769, called, in the long-winded fashion of the time, "The Corporation for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen in the Communion of the Church of England in America."[3] At the outbreak of the war the society already possessed a fund of nearly fifteen thousand pounds. When the war had ended, this society became the meeting-place of the scattered parishes, and the rallying-point for the disorganized Church.

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Pa. pp. 374, 376.
[2] Ib. p. 371.
[3] Perry: History, vol. i. p. 647, where an excellent sketch of this noble charity is given by the late John William Wallace, LL.D.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE.

In 1765 the treaty which shut the French out of North America was signed by England and France. "Well," said the French minister as he signed it, "so we are gone; England will go next." His prophecy was quite correct. It had been fear of the French and their savage allies on the western frontier that kept the colonies from bringing their differences with England to a settlement long ago. Now that danger was gone. Before that they had two foes to consider, now they had but one. The questions at issue were fundamental.

The inevitable conflict.

The war of the Revolution, like that of the Great Rebellion, was one of the inevitables. The social, the political, and, above all, the commercial interests of the two countries, were radically opposed. Absolute submission, peaceable separation, or fight, were the only alternatives. Men shut their eyes to the situation, and sought diligently for some fourth course, but there was none. In ten years from the French peace the issue was made up. Virginia and Massachusetts, the two oldest colonies, where the seeds of strife had had longest time to grow and ripen, led the American side.

Though the issue seems simple now, in the light of its result, it did not seem so then. The popu-

lace divided itself roughly into three classes. First, the great mass of the people, who were inert, apathetic, dreaded the possible calamity of war, and hoped that somebody would hit upon a way of adjusting the difficulties peaceably. Second, the small party of ultra "Tories," who could not conceive of opposition to the powers that be, and looked for relief from the clemency of the king. Third, the small party of patriots who looked forward to, and through, the coming struggle, and burned to have the question settled, by peaceable measures if possible, by war if need be.

Equal division of parties.

But in such cases events move rapidly, and precipitate popular judgment. As men's passions grew more and more engaged, these two parties made forays upon the passive mass, and bore away recruits into either camp. When the two ultimate parties were finally made up they were nearly equally balanced, and remained so until the fortunes of war weakened the Tory side. Even in Massachusetts a majority were at first opposed to the war. The bill which gave it sanction was twice defeated by the Legislature before it was finally passed. In Connecticut the opposition was still more numerous.[1] In New York the parties were so equally divided that when the Provincial Congress chanced to receive notices upon the same day, in 1775, that General Washington was about to cross the Hudson on his way to the headquarters at Cambridge, and that General Tryon had arrived in the harbor and was about to disembark, they ordered the colonel commanding the militia so to dispose of his forces that he could

[1] Sabine: Loyalists in the American Revolution, vol. i. p. 27.

receive "either the General or Governor Tryon, whichever should first arrive, and wait upon them both as well as circumstances would allow."[1] In the far South the situation was the same. The South Carolina patriots and Tories were equally matched in numbers, and drifted into a savage enmity against each other, which was marked throughout the war by atrocities in which each side outdid the other.[2] In the early years of the war, as many as *forty thousand* Tories enlisted in the king's forces.[3] But a far larger number, unable to stem the popular current, and finding their lives in the colonies intolerable, left the country. They went back to England, emigrated to Canada, to Nova Scotia, to the Barbadoes, and to the Spanish settlements. Eleven hundred left Boston in a single day.[4] They included all classes of people, — members of the council, merchants, clergymen, farmers, mechanics, traders. The mother and sister of Gouverneur Morris took the Tory side, and left the country. Ten thousand left New York alone at the time of its evacuation. Those who remained were roughly handled. They became the target of all popular abuse, were lampooned, defrauded of their debts, mobbed, shot at from thickets, tarred and feathered, smothered in smoke-houses like flitches of bacon, had their cattle killed and their houses burned, — and, where they had the opportunity, retaliated in kind.

Exodus of Tories.

The significant thing to us is that, as a rule, they were Episcopalians. The Presbyterians and Baptists in the

[1] Sparks: Life of Washington.
[2] Sabine: Loyalists, vol. i. p. 42.
[2] Roosevelt: Winning of the West, vol. ii. ch. ix.
[3] Sabine: Loyalists, vol. i. p. 71.
[4] Ib., vol. i. p. 25.

Southern, and, with but few exceptions,[1] the Puritans in the Eastern colonies, threw themselves with enthusiasm into the quarrel, on the American side.[2] The position of the Churchmen was perplexing. They were more closely bound to England than were their dissenting fellow-citizens. A large proportion of the laity, and almost the whole of the clergy, remained steadfast in their allegiance to the Crown until the end. But the situations of the laity and the clergy were not the same. The layman was attached to the English Church only on its spiritual, and not its secular side. The clergyman was bound by a double bond. Laymen whose political beliefs led them that way could at the same time say their prayers from the Prayer-Book and fight against the king. They violated no sanction of conscience or previous obligation in so doing. From this class came an extraordinary proportion of the leaders of the Revolution. Washington and Patrick Henry were devout communicants. Franklin was a Churchman, so far as he had any religion at all. The Morrises, Livingston, Sterling, Jay, Richard Henry Lee, Madison, Morgan, the Pendletons, and the Pinckneys, are but examples of the men whom the Church contributed to the American side.

Lay Churchmen's position.

But the position of the clergy was vastly different. In the first place, a large proportion were English by birth and education. Nearly all, except in Virginia and Maryland, were missionaries of the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in For-

Situation of the clergy.

[1] Like Dr. Byles, for example.
[2] Baird: Religion in America, p. 215.

eign Parts." Their livelihood was at stake. At any sign of "disloyalty" their stipends would be cut off,[1] and starvation would confront them. But, above all, each one, at his ordination, had definitely sworn perpetual allegiance to the king. This oath was the insuperable difficulty. It was recorded with the Bishop of London, and also in their own consciences. A very small class, insignificant in number but great in character and influence, believed themselves to have been absolved by the authority of circumstances. They reasoned with themselves that the ordination oath of allegiance to the king was but the historic declaration that priests must be obedient and docile citizens; that it did not mean literally to King George, but to the "powers that be," for which the king there stood; that when those powers were transferred, by forces with which they had nothing to do, to another rule under which they found themselves living, their allegiance was due to the new authority. They argued that the situation here was the same that had been in England at the Revolution of 1688. The great mass of the bishops and clergy had then transferred their allegiance from the *de jure* to the *de facto* king. Why should they not make a similar transfer of obedience to the Republic?

Patriot clergy.

Being thus convinced, sturdy Dr. Muhlenberg accepted his captain's commission, donned his new uniform, put on his gown over it, preached an earnest sermon to his thronged congregation upon the duty of the hour; then laid his gown over the reading-

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Mass. pp. 602, 609.
[1] White: Memoirs, p. 13.

desk, marched out of church, stood at the door with a recruiting sergeant's roll in hand, and enlisted a whole battalion of Continental troops on the spot.[1] Dr. White of Philadelphia became Chaplain of the Continental Congress, and never deviated from the patriotic choice he had made. Dr. Provoost of New York was so uncompromising a patriot that he could not bring himself, in after days, to forgive the Tory Bishop Seabury. But this sentiment was confined almost entirely to the clergy of the middle colonies. It found its formal expression in a letter to the Bishop of London in 1775, in which the clergy declare that "the people will feel and judge for themselves in matters affecting their own civil happiness; and were we capable of any attempt which might have the appearance of drawing them to what they think would be a slavish resignation of their rights, it would be destructive of ourselves, as well as the Church of which we are ministers. It is but justice to our superiors, and your Lordship in particular, to declare that our consciences would not permit us to injure the rights of this country, in which we are to leave our families." [2]

Loyalist clergy.

But the majority of the clergy could not look at the case after this fashion. They could not lift the obligation of the ordination oath off their consciences even if they had wished, — and they did not wish. They were quite ready to join in any respectful address to Great Britain for a redress of the colonial

[1] Ayres: Life of Dr. Muhlenberg, p. 4.

[2] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Pa. p. 472.

[2] The signers were Richard Peters, William Smith, Jacob Duché, Thomas Coombe, William Stringer, and William White.

grievances, but in their hearts they did not regard these grievances as being so very intolerable, after all. They looked at the situation with English eyes. They fondly hoped for, and urged, some amicable settlement of the contest. If no such settlement could be reached, then the same authority which taught them to fear God also bade them to "honor the king." Seabury and Inglis could not quiet their consciences by what they thought the shallow casuistry of White and Provoost. Above all things, they prayed to be delivered from being compelled to choose sides in the issue now joined. But this could not be. Congress appointed July 20, 1775, for a day of fasting and prayer, and called upon all Christians to assemble at their accustomed places of worship. The Church clergy were forced into a corner. To disregard the proclamation entirely would openly fix them in the opposition. To publicly pray for the success of the king and royal arms would be too much to venture. Pray against them they could not. But they must call the congregation together and have a service of some sort. Some said they were entirely ready to do so, for surely never were times when fasting and prayer were more needed. All but four of the clergy in the country, of whom Dr. Seabury was one, opened their churches.[1] But their real sentiments came out in their sermons. The burden of them was *compromise*. If that could not be done, then, it was intimated rather than said, submission would be the duty.

The popular indignation was profound. Laymen declared that the clergy did not voice the real feeling

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Pa. p. 479.

of Churchmen. Newspapers reviled them as Tories, traitors, and British emissaries. "No more passive obedience," was chalked upon the church-doors.[1] One minister writes to England: "It is urged as a just cause of complaint against one of the militia captains, that he had lugged his company to church on a fast day, to hear that old wretch (*meaning me!*) preach, who was always an enemy to the present measures."[2] The Episcopal clergy stood condemned in the eyes of the party who were to carry through the War for Independence and build the Republic. The sentence was harshly carried into execution. The Connecticut clergy assembled at New Haven and determined to suspend all public services, and wait for better times.[3] Those of New York retired to the seclusion of private life, exiled themselves to Nova Scotia, or moved within the British lines. Dr. Seabury became chaplain to a regiment of British infantry. The Church in Virginia was formally disestablished by the colonial government.[4] But neither seclusion, insignificance, nor high character was able to save the clergy from the fury of the populace. Their churches were wrecked, defiled, and burned. Their property was confiscated. Their cattle were killed. They were hooted, pelted, arrested, imprisoned, ducked in the pond, shot at, starved, and banished. The baneful old alliance of the Church with the State here produced its inevitable result. The Church, which in itself was not disliked

Sufferings of the clergy.

[1] Perry: Historical Collections, vol. Pa. p. 481.
[2] Ib.: vol. Pa. p. 481.
[3] Beardsley: History of the Church in Conn., vol. i. p. 318.
[4] Baird: Religion in America, p. 220.

by Americans, was wrecked because its fortunes were bound to a State which they hated.[1]

[1] The following partial list, compiled chiefly from Sabine's "Loyalists in the Revolution," will give an idea of the way the Church was devastated during the war :—

Rev. Mr. Adams, York, Pa.; soused three times in a pond and warned to leave.

Rev. H. Addison, Md.; banished, estate confiscated, of value of thirty thousand pounds.

Rev. John Agnew, Suffolk, Va.; banished.

Rev. John Andrews, Master Episcopal Academy, Conn.; banished.

Rev. East Apthorp, Cambridge, Mass.; banished.

Rev. Dr. Auchmuty, Rector Trinity Church, New York; church, rectory, and school burned; loss twenty thousand pounds.

Rev. Ephraim Avery, Rye; cattle killed, banished.

Rev. Luke Babcock, Phillipsburg, N.Y.; cattle killed; robbed, died.

Rev. Jacob Bailey, Dresden, Md.; robbed, starved, banished.

Rev. Thomas Barton, York, Pa.; imprisoned two years, died.

Rev. Daniel Batewell, York, Pa.; imprisoned, died.

Rev. Abraham Beach, John Beach, Conn.; harried, shot at, cattle killed.

Rev. John Beardsley, Conn.; robbed, banished.

Rev. George Bissett, Newport, R.I.; church wrecked, banished.

Rev. Jonathan Beach, Annapolis, Md.; imprisoned two years.

Rev. John Bowie, Md.; imprisoned two years.

Rev. John Brunskill, Va.; driven away.

Rev. John Bullman, Charleston; banished.

Rev. Mather Byles, Cambridge; banished.

Rev. Henry Carver, King's Chapel, Boston; banished.

Rev. William Clark, Dedham; imprisoned, banished.

Rev. Richard Clark, Charleston; banished.

Rev. Samuel Cook, Shrewsbury, N.J.; driven away.

Rev. Thomas Coombe, Philadelphia; imprisoned, banished.

Rev. Mr. Cooper, Charleston; driven away by his parishioners.

Rev. Jacob Duché, Philadelphia; first chaplain of Congress, turned Tory, banished.

Rev. Edward Edmonston, Baltimore; fled.

Rev. John Eversfield, Md.; tried, discharged as "too old to do any hurt."

Rev. Samuel Fayerweather, R.I.; "silenced."

Rev. Nathaniel Fisher, Salem, Mass.; imprisoned, banished.

Rev. John Graves, Providence; "silenced."

Rev. Matthew Graves, New London, Conn.; driven away by his own people.

Rev. Charles Inglis, Rector Trinity Church, New York; warned not to read prayers for the king; persisted in doing so; an infantry company entered church during service, with beat of drum, to overawe him;

but he read the prayers; compelled to flee; his property confiscated; became first Bishop of Nova Scotia.

Rev. Thomas Johnson, Charlotte Co., Va.; "with a great bowl of grog in his hands drank success to the British arms;" banished.

Rev. Jeremiah Leaming, Stratford, Conn.; his portrait nailed to the sign-post, head downward; imprisoned; left to suffer from cold and nakedness; contracted hip disease; lamed for life.

Rev. William McGilchrist, Salem, Mass.; "silenced."

Rev. Alexander McCrae, Littleton, Va.; mobbed, whipped, threatened with death; but persisted and stayed.

Rev. Mr. Micklejohn, N.C.; banished.

Rev. Richard Moseley, Litchfield, Conn.; banished.

Rev. Harry Monroe, Albany; banished to Canada.

Rev. Samuel Peters, Hebron, Conn.; mobbed, stripped, banished.

Rev. Jonathan Adell, N.J.; arrested, escaped.

Rev. Joseph Reed, Newbern; ejected by his people.

Rev. Winwood Sergeant, Cambridge, Mass.; banished.

Rev. John Scott, Everston, Mass.; arrested, banished.

Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D., Westchester, N.Y.; threatened, shot at, imprisoned, took refuge in British lines; made maps of Long Island for the British army, accepted British chaplaincy.

Rev. John Stuart, missionary to the Mohawks; arrested, chapel defiled, a bottle of rum emptied over the altar, banished.

Rev. Epenetus Townsend, North Salem, N.Y.; arrested, banished, drowned at sea.

Rev. John Troutbeck, King's Chapel, Boston; banished, captured by pirates.

Rev. Roger Viets, Simsbury, Conn.; fined twenty pounds, imprisoned, banished.

Rev. William Walters, Trinity Church, Boston; banished, property of seven thousand pounds confiscated.

Rev. John Weeks, Marblehead, Mass.; banished, died of poverty and exposure.

Rev. Isaac Wilkins, D.D., Westchester, N.Y.; banished, his writings dressed in tar and buzzard's feathers, and burned.

Rev. John Wingate, Orange Co., Va.; books burned.

Rev. Edward Winslow, Quincy, Mass.; banished.

Rev. John Wiswall, Falmouth, Va.; banished.

PART II.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

PART II.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER I.

GATHERING UP THE FRAGMENTS.

The desolation.

When the verdict of the trial by war was reached and the independence of the Colonies recognized by treaty, the English Church in America ceased to exist. As a Church which was content to regard itself as a department of the English state, it could have no being where that state was not. Its fragments lay scattered from Portsmouth to Savannah. The ligature which had fastened these parishes together and tied them to the see of London was now cut, and they fell asunder like so many beads when the string is broken. They had all been wasted by war, and many had perished during the last ten years from sheer neglect. Their members, being generally loyalists, had been proscribed during the conflict, and were now under a political and social ban. They had hoped that England would guarantee their rights in the stipulations of the treaty. They found to their horror that she had abandoned them in the most cold-blooded man-

ner.[1] They had been robbed, outraged, their property confiscated, and their persons roughly handled, and now they not only found that they had no redress, but that they were again confronted with a new peril. During the war the colonists' hands had been full with the foreign enemy. Now that he had withdrawn, they proposed to make a finish of the wretches who had given him aid and comfort. General Greene, Hamilton, Jay, Patrick Henry, Gadsden, and Marion championed their cause in vain.[2] In spite of their arguments that it would be unjust and impolitic now to proscribe men for opinions which twenty years ago had been held by everybody,[3] the passions of the populace ran so high that they set about deliberately to extirpate the hated Tories. They were denounced as monsters who had put themselves beyond the pale of mercy or even justice. Then set in a period of personal violence, social persecution, and legal repression, which is not a pleasant page in American history.[4] The leading patriots, men who had given their best counsel and their best blood for the American cause, tried in vain to stem the tide. They were themselves swept under by it, and some of them well-nigh ruined. Some of the Tories indeed had no right to hope for anything. The score against them for their deeds in the troubled times was so long and ugly that all who bore the same party name with them were taxed to pay it. Many abandoned everything and fled from the storm.

Treatment of Tories.

[1] McMaster: History of the United States, vol. i. p. 109.
[2] Sabine: Loyalists, vol. i. p. 89.
[3] General Greene.
[4] McMaster: vol. i. pp. 109–130.

They embarked in the British men-of-war and were carried back to England. Numbers moved to Florida and the Spanish possessions.[1] Still more went to Nova Scotia and the Bermudas. In this final emigration the weakened Church was still further depleted. It was left without reputation, without money, without men.

Popular opinion of the Church.

The hostility to it *as a Church*, however, rapidly subsided. The fear and hatred with which it had been so long regarded as a possible source of political danger, disappeared almost at once upon the achievement of independence.[2] As a religious sect, it was conceived to be practically defunct. It was regarded as a "piece of heavy baggage which the British had left behind them when they evacuated New York and Boston."[3]

Now, what shall be done with the thrice broken fragments of the Colonial Church of England? What hands shall gather them up and put them together? Upon what principles shall the new Church to be formed from them be organized?

The first sign of movement among the broken members of the body showed itself in Maryland. There had always been a marked difference in temper, habits, and mode of life, among the Eastern, Middle, and Southern colonies. This difference was even more plainly marked in ecclesiastical things. It became most significant in the reconstruction period now before us. In each section a different motive and purpose dominated the men who set about to rebuild the Church.

Three motives producing reorganization.

[1] McMaster: History of the United States, vol. i. p. 111.
[2] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, pp. 91, 93.
[3] An expression of Bishop Williams, of Connecticut.

In Virginia and Maryland the uppermost thought was to save the endowments of which the Church of England had stood possessed before the war. To rescue and hold these, an organization must be created which could have a standing before the law in the new government.

In New England the dominant purpose was to save the Church's ideal; to guarantee its apostolic order; to establish in its completeness that primitive doctrine and discipline for the sake of which many of its clergy had come out of Presbyterianism at great cost.

In the Middle colonies the leaders set clearly before themselves the task to organize a National Church, an Episcopal foundation which would be to all its members what the federal government then in process of construction would be to its citizens. Of the three ideas Dr. Smith of Maryland, Dr. Seabury of Connecticut, and Dr. White of Pennsylvania, became the several champions. The first failed, partly through the faults of its leader, and still more because the thing aimed at was impracticable: the other two succeeded, and the combination of their plans produced the Church substantially as it has continued to be.

The Southern attempt.

The question which first pressed in Virginia and Maryland was a practical one. Who now should administer upon the Colonial Church's estate? The property was a valuable one. It consisted not only of churches, glebes, parsonages, and landed endowments, but also of the right to the proceeds of taxation for religious objects. Who was its owner? It was contended on the one hand that the

property had been created by the state; that the state, while the state was England, had only held the property in trust for the public religious weal; that a new state was now substituted for the old one; that the new one was seized of all the power and right in the premises which the old one had possessed. But it was agreed on all hands that in the new state there should be no religious establishment. What, then, should it do with the Church property which it found on its hands? Should it resume it and secularize it? — retain it as a trust for the benefit of all religious denominations? — turn it over in fee simple to the representatives of the Colonial Episcopal Church? If the latter, who was its representative? The Bishop of London? — that was absurd on the face of it. The various parishes? — they were not independent legal corporations, but only subdivisions of an empire which was now extinct. In any case the question of how to dispose of the proceeds of taxation would still remain.

The Churchmen's feeling was that the property was theirs absolutely; they would not agree that the state had simply held it in trust for them; they insisted that it had been a gift outright. But the practical difficulty could not be evaded. There was no organized Church on the ground which could take it over, even if it were offered. Maryland had indeed, after the Declaration of Independence, "secured to the Church of England all the glebes, churches, chapels, and other property owned by her," [1] but the question now was, who represents the Church of England? [2]

[1] Hawks: Ecclesiastical Contributions, vol. Md. p. 288.
[2] Hawks: Ecclesiastical Contributions, vol. Va. p. 224 *et seq.*

One of the most sagacious men of his age, the Rev. Dr. William Smith, previously rector of the Philadelphia College, and now President of Washington College, lived in Maryland. He foresaw, while the war was raging, that this question would have to be met, and that upon its right answer would depend the Church's temporal fortunes in that State. In 1780 he called a conference of clergy and laymen to consider the matter. His purpose was to organize the *disjecta membra* into a body corporate which could have a local habitation and a name. He gave it the name himself.[1] He called it the "Protestant Episcopal Church." This name, which still obtains, does not seem to have been the result of any special thought or deliberation, but was adopted unconsciously as the title which best expressed the fact. They could not have called it "the Church" in any exclusive sense, for their intention was to approach the Legislature which had just declared that it was not the Church in that sense. They could not call it "the American Church," for there was no American Church. To call it "the Catholic Church" would have been in the face of a common usage which had already given that title to another body. But, in common with all the Churchmen of their time, they assumed that they were Protestant; — Episcopacy was their differentiate. They combined the two facts and gave the Church its present name.

The Church named.

The result of the conference was to recommend that the action already taken by the State, allowing each

[1] Smith: Life of Dr. William Smith, vol. ii. p. 39. Cf. Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 5.

denomination to receive the benefits accruing from taxation, should be accepted; and that, in addition, the Protestant Episcopal parishes should be allowed "to lay rates on pews," or otherwise to increase their revenue.[1]

This was while the war still dragged its length along, and the Legislature took no action upon their recommendation. When peace had come, Dr. Smith induced Governor Paca, his old pupil at the Philadelphia College, to bring the matter forward in his message. At the same time, in conjunction with another minister, he asked leave to call a formal conference.[2] This convention, which met at Annapolis, in 1783, contained eighteen clergymen. It called itself the Protestant Episcopal Church in that State. It declared itself to be the legal and actual successor of the Church of England there; that therefore all glebes, lands, and property belonging to its predecessor now belonged to it by law; that it would be at once its right and its duty to modify the liturgy and customs of the old Church so as to fit the changed political circumstances; that in doing so it must not be thought to destroy its identity; that in order to hold its trusts and discharge its duties it must now proceed forthwith to effect a complete organization; that the prime thing needed for the complete equipment of an Episcopal Church was a bishop. The Rev. Dr. William Smith was elected to fill that office, when, and as soon as, he could procure consecration. Dr. Smith's testimonials of

Organization in Maryland.

[1] Smith: Life, vol. ii. p. 93.
[2] Ib. vol. ii. p. 93.

fitness for this office were signed by the eighteen clergy present, and afterward by the few others in the State who were detained away.[1]

Virginia, in the process of organization, followed much the same lines.[2] In both States the feeling and action were the outcome of their previous habits of Church life. They approached the task upon the side which first presented itself. That was the secular side. Ecclesiastical issues of great importance were bound up with it, but these were not at first so clearly seen as in both the other groups of colonies. But to them fell the weighty task of settling the relation of the Church to the civil power in the new Republic. Before it was finally determined, the Church was shorn of much of her former prerogatives, and lost much property which was equitably hers. But here, as always, the children bore their parents' faults. To disentangle Church and State in the colonies where they had been united for a century and a half, was a task so arduous that it would have been too much to expect it to have been done without errors, and even injustices. But, upon the whole, it was effected with a fair amount of equity.

Relation of Church and State.

[1] Smith: Life of Dr. Wm. Smith, vol. ii. p. 100.
[2] Hawks: Contributions, vol. Va. p. 179, *et seq.*

CHAPTER II.

THE NEW ENGLAND PLAN.

In New England the controlling motive was ecclesiastical. The Church Idea had been far better wrought out there than elsewhere. Two influences had been at work for fifty years, to elevate the tone of Churchmanship. The "New England converts," led by President Cutler and recruited constantly by men of a like way of thinking, had all come to the Episcopal Church from strenuous conviction. They had studied her history. They knew her claims. They had forfeited much which they held dear when they transferred their allegiance to her. They had been called upon again and again to give a reason for their faith. No slight reason would suffice. Their challengers were men who knew how to weigh proofs and to test assumptions. They lived among a people who dearly loved an argument. To hold their own they must know clearly what they believed, and why they believed it. This had compelled them to work out the theory of the Church, and to free it from all subordinate considerations. Naturally they became pronounced Churchmen.

New England Churchmanship.

In this position they were sustained by the disposition of the Society for the Promotion of the Gospel in

Foreign Parts, by which society most of them were supported. The "Venerable Society's" position in this regard had been emphatic from its organization. The New England clergy were agents much to its liking. In the other colonies Episcopacy was often regarded as just a part of the existing order of things. It was accepted without much thought either way. It was as good a mode of Church organization as another, in some points better, but, still, not a thing of life and death value. Its history was venerable; its endowments were valuable; its manners were good; its followers were worthy men; it was a present fact; but its ground and essential reason were not much studied. Beside that, the shocks and disturbances of revolution had brought people into the way of thinking all things capable of change. What institution could have been imagined more unchangeable and established by longer prescription than monarchy? But monarchy had been abandoned as an outworn and useless piece of lumber. Why not Episcopacy also?

The Churchmen of New England were very apprehensive of this latter feeling. What else, they asked, would account for the action of the Burlington Convocation, which entertained the proposition of an Independent Episcopal Church? What but this could explain the pestilent plan which Dr. White had just wrought out in his awful pamphlet?[1] Their own convictions had not been disturbed by the Revolution. Their sympathies had not gone with it. They were Tories. They

Their distrust of the loose views of other Churchmen.

[1] Beardsley: Seabury, p. 97.

accepted its results as a providential dispensation which they could not gainsay, but they had no part or lot in its spirit of change. They had never had any endowments to seduce them from the pure, spiritual conception of the Church, or to distract them now from their clear purpose of securing the primitive Faith and Apostolic Order for which they had already suffered.

Their strength was mainly in Connecticut. When the war was over, there were in that State forty Episcopal congregations, fourteen clergy, and a Church population of about forty thousand.[1] Unlike the other States, Connecticut had not fallen foul of the Tories when victory settled on the American side.[2] They were allowed to repair their broken fortunes unmolested, in whatever way offered, but when they learned what their fellows in New York and Massachusetts were suffering they walked in fear and trembling.

First Connecticut Convention.

Word was quietly passed about among the clergy to attend a meeting to consider the state of affairs. Ten of the fourteen met at Woodbury, a little straggling village among the hills of Litchfield County. Their meeting was kept a profound secret.[2] They were very doubtful as to how their plans would be regarded by the populace. Ten years before, an attempt to secure the Episcopate would have raised a howl; there was reason to believe that it would be still more strongly resented now that the Presbyte-

[1] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 137.
[1] Beardsley: History of Church in Connecticut, vol. i. p. 346.
[2] Ib., vol. i. p. 353.
[3] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 78.
[3] Beardsley: History of Church in Connecticut, vol. i. p. 346.

rians were in position to formulate their objections in the shape of law. Nor were the clergy sure of their own laymen. These were not taken into council. Those of them who were loyalists were in sufficient peril already. It would require all their circumspection to come out of it unscathed. To exacerbate the situation by a revival of the Episcopate seemed very madness. But the clergy were both courageous and clear-minded. They saw distinctly that the life of the Church was at stake. If anything effective were to be done to secure it, it must be done at once. There was serious risk in what they proposed to do. The temper of the new State towards Episcopacy had not been tested, and, judging by the past, the worst might be looked for. They would therefore not involve the laymen in the project at all; they would proceed at their own proper peril. If they succeeded in building the Church, well and good; if not, they would fail like honest men and conscientious Churchmen. There are no records extant of their proceedings at this conference at Woodbury. No minutes were kept, no roll of the members' names has come down. In truth, it was hardly a convention in any sense. Every man present had had his mind made up, long before, what was to be done. There was only one thing to do, that was to secure a bishop. The meeting was only to determine whom they should select to undertake that duty. It was no question of preferment, nor were there many available men to choose from. Whoever he might be must, of course, be a man whose life and learning would be respectable; but they could all meet that requirement. The difficulty was to find a

The political obstacles.

man who could accept it. It would mean for him, in all probability, personal unpopularity among his neighbors at home, a costly and dangerous voyage over the sea for consecration, infinite labor to meet and overcome the prejudices of the authorities in the English Church, and, in all likelihood, permanent expatriation.

Their choice fell finally upon two men, either of whom would be suitable, but neither of whom was present. They were the Rev. Drs. Jeremiah Leaming and Samuel Seabury. They were both in New York, but belonged in Connecticut by birth and service. Dr. Leaming was an old man. He had been rector of the church at Norwalk, but had been driven away, with loss of goods and friends. When he was informed of the action of his Connecticut brethren, he at once declined the office. He was too infirm to bear the voyage, and, at his age, he could not face the probability of making for himself a new home outside of the State. Dr. Seabury accepted. He was a Connecticut man by birth, and was now fifty-four years of age, in the vigor of his life. He was the son of one of the "New England converts" from Puritanism, and, like all that stock, a High Churchman. He had studied medicine at Edinburgh, been ordained in England, had served as a missionary in Long Island and New Jersey. At the beginning of the war he was rector of the parish at Westchester, N. Y. He had been a pronounced and active Tory from the beginning. With his friends Inglis and Chandler, he had conducted a literary bureau advocating the British side of the contest. He was generally believed to have written the biting

Choosing the first bishop.

Dr. Seabury's career.

letters of Wilkins, signed by "A Westchester Farmer." He had published some very "Free Thoughts on the Proceedings of the Congress at Philadelphia." [1] He had been seized by the Continental authorities and imprisoned, had escaped and taken refuge in the British lines on Long Island. While there he had used his topographical knowledge of the surrounding country to make maps for the military operations of his protectors; had been mustered into the British regular service as chaplain of an infantry regiment; and was now, after his retirement, receiving English half-pay. His personal character and devotion in his priestly office were well known to those who chose him bishop, and were, in point of fact, beyond all question. Both ecclesiastically and politically he was in every way grateful to them. He represented their spirit and their situation more fairly than any other man who could have been chosen.

At the time they selected him they outlined the plan of procedure he was to follow.[2] He was to go to England and lay before the bishops his credentials, submitting to them the facts which, in the judgment of the Connecticut people, made the appointment of an American bishop an immediate and imperative necessity. He was to leave no stone unturned to secure from them his consecration. In case he should fail of this, he was to go to Scotland and endeavor to secure consecration at the hands of the Nonjuring Episcopal College there. If he should succeed in either place he was to return to Connecticut, — if he would be allowed

The Connecticut plan.

[1] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 30.
[2] Ib., p. 104.

to do so. Upon this point there was much doubt. The status of the loyalists had not yet been determined. The treaty was still pending. Its terms might ensure restitution for their losses and security for the future, or it might do the opposite. That remained to be seen. Then there was no certainty that all the States would take the same action upon this subject. It might prove to be possible for a Tory bishop to live in one section, and be outlawed in another. In view of these contingencies he was, if consecrated, to return to Connecticut if that course should be open; if that should be closed, then to fix his seat in some other State. If all should be barred against him, then he was to make his habitation across the border in Nova Scotia. There he could be reached by candidates for ordination without the burden of crossing the sea, and from there he could look out and superintend the Church's growth in New England, while he and it would wait for better times. The scheme had the indorsement of Sir Guy Carleton, and Dr. Seabury sailed away to England in the returning flag-ship of Admiral Digby[1] to carry it into effect.

The sentiment in England.

Upon his arrival he found the prospect of success very small indeed. The bishops, however they might sympathize with the colonial Church, were chagrined at the defeat of the British power. Lowth, the great Bishop of London, had flatly refused to lay his hands upon any man who was going back to America to preach,[2] even though he had been assured

[1] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, pp. 95, 96.
[2] McMaster: History of the United States, vol. i. p. 230.

that Parliament would not demur at his omitting the oaths.[1] To the current conception of the nature of the Episcopal office, it seemed even more absurd to give it to the petty States than it would have been to give it to the colonies, where it could at least have had the moral support of the English kingdom. The bishops were stolid, impracticable, hopeless. While they treated Seabury with consideration, and a few of them manifested a curious interest in American affairs, they were incapable of appreciating, as the Americans did, the kind of an Episcopate which was desired. They were concerned about the "dignity" of the office. There was no suitable provision for the proper support[2] of Dr. Seabury, so that he might live in a style which a bishop ought to maintain. The office would fall into contempt.[3] Moreover, their hands were tied. The law required that a bishop, at his consecration, must swear allegiance to the Crown. They shook their heads when it was suggested that the king in council might waive that requirement. That seemed sufficient to a few, but to most it appeared that an Act of Parliament only could give exemption. Beside that, they feared that if they should overcome all difficulties and consecrate an American bishop, it would be construed as an unfriendly act by the new States, who

English bishops' reluctance.

[1] Abbey: English Church and its Bishops, vol. ii. p. 186.

[2] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 111.

[3] This idea was slow to disappear. After the middle of the present century, when Bishop Wilberforce had fixed, by his example, the modern standard, an old don complained that —"I remember when a bishop never came into Oxford without a coach and six. But what does Sam do? Just mounts his horse, without even a groom behind him, and rides away to a visitation before breakfast!"

had now taken their place in the family of nations. England had had trouble enough with America; why should they provoke her further? Her opinion had always been pronounced against this action, and the bishops could not see that the ground of the opposition had dropped out when the Church became innocuous on its political side.

In addition to all this, they were by no means satisfied that Connecticut would receive Bishop Seabury if he should be consecrated. If this should turn out to be the case, they would have on their hands a churchless bishop, who would be an awkward personage to dispose of. This last difficulty was met by showing the declaration of all the leading members of the Connecticut Legislature, to the effect that there would be no political objection whatever to receiving the new bishop, but that, on the contrary, there were so many Episcopalians in the State that it would be for the public good to give them a head.

After interminable delay, an Act of Parliament was introduced to allow a dispensation from the oaths, in the case of bishops consecrated for foreign countries. The bishops gave a tardy assent, but the preliminary requirements were endless. When a whole year had passed, Dr. Seabury was at the end of his patience and of his money. He was a poor man. He had been living for a year in London at his own expense, and there seemed to be no more prospect than when he had first come. He therefore turned his back upon England and her impotent, State-bound Church, and went to Scotland.

The influence upon the American Church of Seabury's Scotch connection has been so far-reaching that it is necessary here to suspend the story long enough to trace its origin. In Scotland there were two Episcopal Churches, neither of which recognized the other.[1] At the Revolution of 1688, when the Stuarts were deported, and William of Orange came to the throne, the Episcopalians and Presbyterians in Scotland were not unequally divided.[2] William offered the support of the government to the Episcopalians, but they would have nothing to do with him. They declared their unalterable loyalty to the Stuart line. When the bishops to a man, and most of the clergy and people, turned their backs upon his offer, he gave his patronage to the Presbyterians. Presbytery was established, and Episcopacy was proscribed. The bishops and clergy who refused to take William's oath — and hence were called *nonjurors* — were deprived and their places filled by Presbyterians. Those of the clergy who did take the oath were protected, but placed under the sharp oversight of the Presbyterian General Assembly. Then succeeded a dreadful century for Scotch Episcopalians. Even though it cannot be denied that they had brought the evils on themselves by their factious attachment to the wretched Stuarts, still, their stubborn fixity of purpose in following their twisted consciences must excite admiration. Their marked feature was their Jacobitism. Attachment to their royal line was with them a religious cult.

The Scotch and New England churches.

The "Nonjurors."

[1] Abbey: English Church and Bishops, vol. ii. pp. 176–187.
[2] Grub: Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, vol. iii. p. 316.

James Stuart was the "anointed of the Lord." After him they turned to poor "Prince Chairlie," and took him to their hearts. When Charles Edward, the debauched "Chevalier," died, in 1788, their last idol was broken, but they continued even then to offer a sentimental devotion before an empty throne. In the risings of 1715 and 1745, the Episcopalians were the head and front. After the last, the English government proceeded deliberately to extirpate them as a brood of inveterate treason-hatchers. After Culloden, the Duke of Cumberland, by the King's command, burned every chapel in his path. Scotch orders were declared null and void.[1] It was made a penal offence for more than five nonjurors to assemble for worship. They were driven into holes and corners. The well-disposed clergy and men in English orders were introduced as far as possible. These latter were regarded by the nonjurors as intruders, and they in turn called the others traitors. The Scotch Episcopalians were detested equally by Scotch Presbyterians and English Churchmen. It was an open question whether the Churches in the two kingdoms were even in communion.[2] Whether they were or not, they certainly were not in sympathy. The Scotch were all Jacobites and all High Churchmen, and in these respects had few in England like them. Two Liturgies had been in use in Scotland for a century and a half. In Edinburgh and the south the English was adopted; but at Aberdeen

[1] This was the ground of the constant complaint made by the Churchmen of Virginia and Maryland, at that date, that the clergy who came over to them were "Scotchmen."

[2] Grub: Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, vol. iii. p. 370.

and the north the Liturgy in use was substantially the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. In its sacramental teaching it was far more emphatic than the English book. After a long and earnest controversy, this Liturgy, in a revised form, was adopted for general use in Scotland in 1764. By that time the repressive laws had been allowed quietly to become relaxed so that the nonjuring remnant, which had its existence mainly about Aberdeen and the Northern Highlands, could meet without molestation.

It was to the bishops of this obscure and broken body that Dr. Seabury turned when he despaired of English consecration. He found in them men of his own spiritual kin. They welcomed him as a man after their own heart. Bishop John Skinner possessed a sort of private chapel, made by throwing together the upper rooms of his modest house in Aberdeen. In that chapel Dr. Seabury was consecrated bishop, November 14, 1784. His consecrators were Robert Kilgour, Arthur Petrie, and John Skinner. They and their Church had a strange similarity to him and his. Both Churches had, through their political situation, been driven to emphasize strongly the divine side of Episcopacy. They both had their homes in the midst of a hostile Presbyterian community. They had each been trained to recognize a king who was hateful to their fellow-citizens. The people in both cases had learned to live their religious lives apart from the people among whom they dwelt. They were not readily touched by the spirit of their time and place. Their spirit was, at its best, serene, assured, self-contained. But it had, and has,

its besetting sins. The Churchmen of the nonjuring, Seabury type have been often found to be impracticable, narrow, prejudiced, governed in their actions by inherited sentiments rather than by present facts. But they brought to the building of the American Church its clearly defined architecture. This principle was guaranteed, as far as was possible to do, by the *Concordat* agreed to by Seabury and the Scotch Episcopal College.[1] This secured the principle of national autonomy by the pledge that the American Church would hold no fellowship with the intruding Episcopal organization in Scotland. It insured Catholic doctrine by the pledge that Seabury would use his endeavor to have the Scotch Communion Office given place in the American Liturgy, — a pledge which he was able to redeem.

Thus, after the labors of one hundred and seventy-five years, there was, when Bishop Seabury returned, an Episcopal Church in America.

He became rector of the parish at New London. He called a convocation of the Connecticut clergy, displayed his certificates of consecration, received their pledge of canonical obedience, avowed the principles which would control his work, and began the Church's share in the task of making and keeping a new nation Christian.

1 Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 150.

CHAPTER III.

THE FEDERAL IDEA.

PHILADELPHIA was the American College of Statesmanship. As the meeting-place of the Continental Congress, and, for the most part, the seat of government, it brought together that remarkable group of men who may truthfully be called the builders of the nation. It was the meeting-place of Franklin, Washington, Jay, Madison, Jefferson, Hamilton, Randolph, and Morris. These men were at once students and teachers. They differed widely among themselves as to the exact appearance which the new nation would present when established, but upon one thing they all agreed, — America was a nation. She had and must have an independent life of her own. Beside that, they saw clearly that the various sections of the country were so intimately bound together that their interests must be in common. The long-drawn debates through which the Federal Constitution was fashioned, and the popular tumults amidst which it got itself adopted, all ended by fixing upon the public mind the firm conviction which the leading Federalists had held from the beginning, that the nation is one, and must be bound together in a common government.

Colonial training in statesmanship.

The Rev. William White, rector of Christ Church,

Philadelphia, had spent his whole life in close acquaintance with these statesmen. He approached the problem of the American Church in the same spirit that they did the American State. None of his contemporaries surpassed and few equalled him in sagacity. When the war ended he was thirty-five years old. He was well born, well bred, and well educated,[1] both in this country and abroad. In England he was a friend of Dr. Johnson; had him for his guest at his inn; chatted with him while he watched him at work on his lexicon; supped with him at Kensington; and wrote him when he came back to Philadelphia.[2] He was on familiar terms with Goldsmith, visited him, praised his work, and condoled with him that so clever a man should have to harness his genius to a cart to earn his daily bread.[3] He was ordained in England; became Assistant, and soon after Rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia; was chosen Chaplain of Congress; and, when the war ended, was next after Franklin, the leading citizen of the State. While Dr. Smith, of Maryland, was engrossed with the small economies of a struggling college, and Dr. Seabury was observing the petty routine of an infantry barracks, Dr. White was unconsciously learning the statecraft which guided the founders of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Rev. Dr. White.

He took the first step by calling together a few friends at his own house[4] to talk over the situation.

[1] White: Memoirs, Introduction of Dr. DaCosta, p. liii
[1] Norton: Life of Bishop White, p. 10.
[1] Wilson: Life of Bishop White.
[2] Norton: Life of Bishop White, p. 21.
[3] Ib., p. 21.
[4] White: Memoirs, p. 93.

No plan of procedure was proposed, but the men present were found to be of the same mind with him.

The conference at New Brunswick.

In May of 1784, there was a meeting in New Brunswick, N. J., of the managers of the "Society for the Relief of the Widows and Orphans of Clergymen." This society had been organized twenty years before, and at the outbreak of the war had held considerable funds. Its board was made up of members from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, acting conjointly. They had had no meeting for more than seven years. Now they came together to re-organize. When their business was transacted, they fell to discussing the general condition of the Church. Some prominent laymen who chanced to be at the same place were called in to assist. During the discussion they learned *for the first time*[2] of the action which Connecticut had taken. So secretly had the New England people carried forward their project that the Churchmen of the Middle colonies were in ignorance of it, though Dr. Seabury, the bishop-elect, had already been in England for nearly a year! In point of fact, the people of the two sections distrusted each other equally. In the East they feared the "latitudinarianism" of the South; in the South they dreaded the "ecclesiasticism" of the East. Can this difference be a permanent affair of latitude?

The result of the informal discussion at Brunswick was to issue a call for a conference of Churchmen from all the States, to be held at New York, in October of the same year. Delegations came to this meeting from

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 84.

Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Connecticut. The Connecticut delegation stated at the outset, however, that they were not at liberty to take any formal part in the deliberations while they were awaiting the result of Dr. Seabury's journey to England. The others present proceeded to formulate some general and fundamental principles of organization to be recommended for adoption by the churches in the several States.[1]

Fundamental principles.

Those principles contemplated: (*a*) A Federal, Constitutional Church; (*b*) the several States to be its units; (*c*) its governing body to include both clergy and laymen; (*d*) the maintenance of continuity with the Church of England, making such changes in worship and discipline only as the changed political

[1] The leading mind in formulating these principles was Dr. White. As finally adopted by the united Church, they were substantially the same that he submitted to the first little group of clergy at his own house in Philadelphia. The form in which they were submitted to the States for action was as follows: —

First, That there be a General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States of *America*.

Second, That the Episcopal Church in each State send Deputies to the Convention, consisting of Clergy and Laity.

Third, That associated congregations, in two or more States, may send Deputies jointly.

Fourth, That the said Church shall maintain the doctrines of the Gospel as now held by the Church of *England*, and shall adhere to the Liturgy of the said Church, as far as shall be consistent with the *American* Revolution, and the Constitution of the respective States.

Fifth, That in every State where there shall be a Bishop duly consecrated and settled, he shall be considered as a member of the Convention *ex officio*.

Sixth, That the Clergy and Laity assembled in Convention, shall deliberate in one body, but shall vote separately, and the concurrence of both shall be necessary to give validity to every measure.

Seventh, That no powers be delegated to a general ecclesiastical government, except such as cannot conveniently be exercised by the Clergy and Laity in their respective congregations.

situation might render necessary; (*e*) to confer no powers upon the general body save such as could not conveniently be exercised by the several local churches. The few clergy in Massachusetts and to the eastward were not present, but held a conference of their own, at which they adopted substantially the same fundamental principles.

The conference had no power to do more than recommend to the churches such principles or actions as seemed to its members desirable. But there was no prince or parliament to summon a council, so this conference ventured to do so. They issued a call summoning the churches in the several States to send delegates to a Constitutional Convention to be held at Philadelphia on St. Michael's Day, September, 1785. New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina responded with representatives. Connecticut declined; Massachusetts sent a letter. When the Convention met, two conflicting plans of procedure were confronted. The ecclesiastical idea of New England and the federal idea of the Middle colonies were now face to face.[1]

Constitutional Convention.

The former insisted that nothing could be done unless they began the business at the right end. The first thing necessary is to secure bishops; nothing binding can be enacted by the Church until the Church is present; the Church is not present and cannot be until its chief officers are on the ground; anything which such conventions as this may

Two possible policies.

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 109.

do will be but as the arrangements which children might make in a household while the father is abroad; when he comes he may set them all aside; the bishop is the source of authority; in his absence there is no authority.[1]

The other side urged in reply, that if the father has his rights and powers the children also have theirs; in this case the children are quite grown up and capable; their action, within its proper sphere, is legitimate and will be valid. In addition, the practical difficulties in the way of the other scheme were insurmountable. Who could determine what number of clergy or parishes should have the right to choose a bishop? Shall it be the clergy of a State? But by what authority is a political territory made a boundary for the Church's action? What is to hinder any group of half a dozen clergy anywhere to combine and choose a bishop? The outcome would be confusion worse confounded. Half a dozen "bishoprics" might spring up in the same State. And even if they should be confined to a single one for each State, what assurance could be given that they would come into federation? Unless some constitution and law could be agreed upon in advance, only anarchy could be looked for.

Guided by this view, the Convention proceeded to its momentous task without New England. The constitution of the Episcopal Church they then elaborated is a document worthy of profound attention. If the Presbyterians may claim to have produced the spirit and

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 112.
[1] Beardsley: Life of Bishop Seabury, p. 234.

form of the Declaration of Independence,[1] Churchmen may claim with a better right to have laid down the lines of the National Constitution. The truth is that in both cases a striking coincidence is all. The constitution of the Church in point of time preceded that of the nation. But they were the handiwork of the same men, and the result of the same set of circumstances. Dr. White and Dr. Smith had been fellow-students in statecraft with those mighty men who built and launched the ship of State. Their opportunity to put their principles in form came when they applied them to the Church's constitution.[2] In its salient features it anticipated that other one which was given to the American people five years later. It contemplated: (*a*) a national organization; (*b*) the States to be its component units; (*c*) its governing body to be composed of two orders, clergy and laity;[3] (*d*) each State to retain in its own hand a sovereign authority, and to conduct its own affairs. On its political side these were its cardinal features. In addition it provided for things ecclesiastical and doctrinal. There was to be:[4] (*a*) a Triennial Convention; (*b*) bishops when obtained were to be *ex-officio* members of the convention; (*c*) persons were to be admitted to Orders upon subscription generally to the Holy

State and Church Constitutions.

[1] "The Mecklenburg Declaration," Craighead: Scotch and Irish Seeds, p. 327.

[1] Briggs: American Presbyterianism, p. 349.

[2] It was draughted by Dr. White. White: Memoirs, p. 93.

[3] Bishop Seabury's contention that the bishops should constitute a still third house disarranged the scheme as it lay in Bishop White's mind. The balance was restored again by merging into one house the first two proposed.

[4] Journal of Convention of 1785.

Scriptures, and a pledge of canonical obedience to the ecclesiastical authorities; (*d*) the English Prayer-Book was to be the basis of the Liturgy, but to be modified so as to bring it into agreement with the new political arrangements.

Laymen in Church councils.

The provision in its fundamental law for the admission of the laity into the Church's governing body as an independent estate deserves particular remark. It proposed an arrangement which had not been in operation for fifteen centuries, — probably for sixteen. It was a return to the practice of the most primitive period. Those who were under the domination of the ecclesiastical ideas which had been current at least since Constantine's time, like Bishop Seabury and his fellow-prelates in England, stumbled at it. It was true that kings and princes had for centuries had a potential voice in causes ecclesiastic, but this had not been in their capacity as laymen, but as "ministers ordained of God." The plan proposed was radically different, and it had no contemporary illustration. The churches then in existence which were organized after the Independent fashion were based upon the theory which they still maintain, — that there is no genuine distinction between priests and laymen. To their view they are both alike, and equally, "kings and priests unto God." In the Presbyterian scheme the elders, who at first glance might be taken for laymen, were not so, but were *ordained* men. For the scheme proposed by the Church, which has as an organizing principle the doctrine of the Ministry, there was no example extant, and it had no imitators for many a year. It is

the key to a proper understanding of the Church's legislation since its adoption. Its radical defect, in the form first proposed, was that it provided no proper place for the intrinsic differences of power and right among the orders of the Ministry. It shut the Episcopate out from its proper place. Bishop Seabury became the champion of his order. Fortunately, in the issue his candid, though determined spirit, together with Dr. White's sagacity and incomparable diplomacy, effected that coalescence of the two views which is the Church's present possession. But before the consummation was reached much was to be done.

The Convention proceeded to the second item of its *agenda*.

Revising the Prayer-Book.

The English Prayer-Book had been in use ever since the planting of the colonies. The somewhat superstitious reverence for it, however, which, half a century later, came to regard it as incapable of being changed, did not then generally prevail. Some changes in it were imperative. It was English, and the Church was American. It must either be made catholic, so as to be of universal fitness, or the political portions of it must be made American also. The Convention approached the revision of it with a light-heartedness somewhat startling to those who are familiar with the arduous labors of later years in the same line. The first purpose entertained was to change only its political portions, but, the task being once entered upon, the opportunity to make other desired alterations seemed too good to be thrown away. A committee of one clergyman and one layman from each State represented was

appointed to submit to the Convention a schedule of changes deemed desirable.[1] After three days' work of the committee, they reported the revised book. The Convention spent four days in considering the proposed changes, by which time they had taken action upon all that related to political things. There they rested, and referred the other propositions back to the committee, to be acted upon by them after adjournment. There was a lack of clearness in the instructions, which left the committee in doubt as to whether they were to complete the revision and publish the book, or whether they were to report their work to the next Convention for approval. They acted upon the former opinion, completed their task, and published that edition of the Common Prayer known as the "Proposed Book." The work was done chiefly by Dr. Smith of Maryland and Dr. White of Pennsylvania, having before them the opinions which the other members of the committee had expressed generally before they departed to their far-away homes.

The "Proposed Book."

The changes from the English Prayer-Book may be grouped conveniently into five categories. The examples, by no means exhaustive, here set forth under each, will give a conception of the "Proposed Book's" peculiarities.

(1) *Political:* — Prayers for the king's majesty, for the princes, royal family, and for the High Court of Parliament, were stricken out, and in their stead were placed the prayers for the President and for the Congress.

The observation of the 5th November, the 30th Janu-

[1] Convention Journal, 1785.

ary, the 29th May, and the 25th October was omitted, and instead thereof a service was inserted for the 4th July, "being the Anniversary of Independence."

(2) *Changes in the Interest of Taste:* — Such as, "didst humble thyself to be born of a virgin," for "didst not abhor the virgin's womb;" omitting the plain-spoken and objectionable statement of the purpose of matrimony from the exhortation in the Marriage Service; omitting the "Commination, or denouncing of God's anger and judgment against sinners;" numerous verbal changes of phrases which were deemed inept or inelegant.

(3) *Anti-Sacerdotal Changes:* — For example, substituting "A Declaration to be made by the Minister concerning the Forgiveness of Sins," for "The Absolution or Remission of Sins to be pronounced by the Priest;" omitting the sign of the cross in Baptism; omitting the phrase "regenerate" in the post-baptismal exhortation; changing in the Catechism the definition of the effect of Baptism from "made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven," to "made a member of the Christian Church;" omitting "unbaptized" from the limitations of use in the Burial Service.[1]

(4) *Changes in the Interest of Liberty:* — The selections of Psalms to be used to be left to the discretion of the Minister; and likewise the Scripture Lessons.

(5) *Dogmatic Changes:* — The Athanasian and the Nicene Creeds were omitted; the "descent into hell"

[1] The animus of the changes under this head is evident from the fact that the book was long afterward reprinted for use by the followers of Bishop Cummins.

was left out of the Apostles' Creed; the *Gloria Patri* was omitted after the versicles, after each separate psalm, and generally its use reduced to a minimum; the phrase "damnation" in the Communion Warning was altered into "condemnation;" the words "as our hope is this our brother doth," were dropped from the Burial Service, — and the like.

Two of the categories deserve special consideration. The Introduction of the Office for the Fourth of July was a source of much uneasiness. The large majority of the clergy and people were Tories. It was asking a good deal to expect them to adopt the frame of thankfulness which the service postulates. It was much as though the Confederate States' Churchmen, after the Civil War, should have been required to return thanks for the surrender at Appomattox. It was introduced against the strenuous opposition of Dr. White and such unquestionable patriots as he.[1] But, as is so likely to be the case, the class of men whom General Grant graphically described as those "who did not get warmed up until the fight was over," prevailed to have it introduced, and the Tory members of the Convention allowed it to pass in silence. In after years it might well have found a place among the Offices, but at the time it could but be a stumbling-block. When adopted, Dr. White, who had striven against it, was almost the only man who used it.[2] Only in two or three places outside of Philadelphia was it ever heard.

Service for Fourth of July.

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 117.
[2] Ib., p. 119.

The other list is that of dogmatic changes. A glance at them will show that the revisers either doubted the truth or questioned the form of statement of certain doctrines which were and are generally held to be of prime importance. Foremost among them is the dogma of the Trinity. Their treatment of it leads to the inquiry whether they were at all, and, if so, to what extent, under the influence of the Unitarian movement then beginning to attract attention in America?

Anti-dogmatic spirit.

As has been pointed out, the Deistical infidelity so rife in England and so prolific of evil in the English life of the eighteenth century, never reached the same extent in this country, but yet it made itself felt. About 1760 the negative Deism began to take on the positive form of what has since been called Unitarianism, under the lead of Lardner and Priestly.[1] In the colonies it retained its negative form, and in that shape spread widely. The scepticism of Hume and Gibbon dominated many educated men. It was especially prevalent in the Middle and Southern colonies.[2] In Boston and its neighborhood it put on the dogmatic dress of Unitarianism. In that shape it came sharply in contact with the Church. The minister in charge of King's Chapel, Mr. Freeman, a man who had not yet been ordained in any wise, was a pronounced Unitarian. The majority of the congregation agreed with him. They found the English Prayer-Book unsuited to their use, and revised it so as to eliminate the

Unitarianism.

[1] Abbey: English Church and Bishops, vol. ii. p. 129.
[2] Sabine: Loyalists, vol. i. p. 141.

doctrine of the Trinity. King's Chapel still called itself a parish of the Episcopal Church. When Bishop Seabury returned with his office, he was asked to ordain Freeman. He emphatically declined. Bishop Provoost of New York was afterwards solicited to do the same. He neither complied nor refused, but referred the matter to the Convention for advice and consent. The advice was adverse.[1] But the King's Chapel people declared that they were justified in hoping that Bishop Provoost would comply, on account of what they knew to be his own sentiment as well as that of some of his brethren in Pennsylvania and the South.[2] They said that he had proposed in the Convention at Philadelphia to omit the Invocations to the Son, the Holy Ghost, and the Trinity, from the Litany.[3] Such a proposition had been made in the Convention [4] by another person, and there is reason to believe that it expressed a prevalent feeling, not in favor of Unitarianism, but against the attempt to dogmatize upon the great mysteries of religion.[5] This seems to be the key to the final action of the Church in both directions. They cast out the Athanasian Creed, not because they disbelieved it, but because they disliked it as an impotent attempt to state what cannot be

1 History of Unitarianism: fourth edition, Boston, 1815, p. 13.

2 Ib., p. 13.

3 Rev. Dr. DaCosta, in editing the memoirs of Bishop White, flatly denies the truth of this statement, and refers to Wilson's Life of Bishop White for its refutation (p. 325). The correspondence of Bishop White there printed does not seem to furnish the refutation. The categorical assertion of Mr. Belsham appears, in the absence of both evidence and probability to the contrary, to be correct.

4 White: Memoirs, p. 116.

5 Bishop White says: "I am no friend to these metaphysical distinctions which have perplexed the present subject and discredited Divine truth." Wilson: Life of Bishop White, p. 325.

stated. On the other hand, they would not ordain Mr. Freeman even to retain the King's Chapel congregation, because they equally disliked the dogmatic spirit of Unitarianism. This seeming lack of certitude, want of definiteness in doctrine, this repugnance to nice definitions, was altogether distasteful to the New England Church.[1] For this, in some places, as well as for the very opposite reason in others, the Proposed Book was received by the Church generally with scant favor. The best proof of this was that it would not sell.[2] Even when Dr. White had packages of them sent North and South, and advertised assiduously, they still stood on the booksellers' shelves. New England would not touch it. New Jersey flatly rejected it. Maryland wanted the Nicene Creed put back, and South Carolina wanted still more left out. Pennsylvania and Virginia proposed still further amendments. The parishes generally kept on using the English Book, to which they were accustomed, the officiating minister making such changes as he found necessary.

The Episcopate.

Having formulated a Constitution and taken the action which they believed would settle a Liturgy, the Convocation proceeded to consider the Episcopate. In this also, their purpose of a National Church controlled. They had no mind to send one of their number abroad for consecration, as Bishop Seabury had gone, accredited only by a little group of unknown clergymen. Whoever went should

[1] Bishop Seabury's Second Charge.
[1] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 267.
[1] Perry: Hist., vol. ii. p. 119.
[2] Beardsley: Seabury, p. 309.

go with a backing and authority which would compel a speedy answer for or against their request. Indeed the leaders among them had determined not to go at all without an assurance in advance that they would gain their object.[1] To secure this they drew up an Address to the Archbishops and Bishops of England. In it they set forth the situation in which the Episcopal Churches had been left by the result of the War for Independence; acknowledge the benefits they had received from the Mother Church in former days; declare their intention not to approach the English State in any wise; and ask the Bishops purely in their spiritual capacity to consecrate such fit men as the Convention representing the American Episcopal Church may send. They intimate plainly that if any legal obstacles should be in the way of the Bishops acting in the matter, it must be their own concern to have them removed.

Address to the English Bishops.

With the Address were sent certificates from the Executives of New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, to the effect that there was no political obstacle on this side of the ocean, and that the Church, when its organization should have been completed by bishops, would be allowed entire liberty to live unmolested.[2] The whole was intrusted to John Adams, the American ambassador in England. Though anything but a Churchman himself, he performed the duty required of

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 139. "They who went had all along made up their minds not to go until the way should be opened by previous negotiation."

[2] White: Memoirs, p. 22.

him with interest and zeal.[1] He laid the Address and accompanying certificates before the Archbishop in such a way as to secure immediate and practical attention.

Meanwhile the Convention adjourned to wait a reply. When it came it was not very satisfactory. Upon the general question, the Bishops answered, that they were ready and willing to consecrate, but that there were some things which needed to first be cleared up. Queer stories had come to them about this Philadelphia Convention. It was reported that they had thrown overboard all the Church's Creeds, or, at least, had reduced them to a point where they could hardly be seen; that they had torn the Prayer-Book all to shreds; that they had adopted a Constitution which gave laymen an unheard-of power in the Church, even to the extent of making it possible for them to pass judgment on bishops; while to the bishops themselves no real power was given. These matters needed explanation. Until further information should be received they could take no action. If a satisfactory explanation could be given, or if the obnoxious arrangements should be modified, they stood ready to consecrate.

The Bishops' reply.

Upon receipt of this reply the Convention was hastily summoned to meet at Wilmington in October, 1786. The meeting was short and effective. They prepared an answer, saying that the Bishops had misapprehended the position given to the laity in the new Constitution;

[1] "There is no part of my life on which I look back with more satisfaction than the part I took, bold, daring, and hazardous as it was to me and mine, in the introduction of Episcopacy in America."—JOHN ADAMS, in Letter to Bishop White. Wilson: Life of Bishop White, p. 325.

that the Nicene Creed and the Apostles' Creed, unmutilated, would be retained; that the English Prayer-Book should remain as the standard until it should be replaced by a National Convention with unquestioned power.

Then they called the roll of States to know if any had chosen men for bishops. New York responded with the name of Dr. Provoost; Pennsylvania with that of Dr. White; Virginia with Dr. Griffith.

Bishops chosen.

Maryland had chosen the celebrated Dr. Smith three years before. Distinguished above all the clergy of his time, a statesman, a theologian, a man of affairs, a Doctor of Divinity of Dublin and Aberdeen, the leader in the Southern Church, and the oft-chosen President of the Convention, he had grave defects of character, which led the Convention to pass him by in silence.[1] His political career had been open to serious criticism. He had an uncertain temper. He had determined enemies. His personal habits exposed him to criticism, even in a bibulous age.

Dr. Griffith found himself to be too poor to make the journey to England, and the Church in Virginia failed to provide him with the means to pay his expenses.[2]

Drs. White and Provoost went their way to London, and were consecrated bishops in Lambeth Chapel, February 4, 1787. The next day they turned their faces homeward, and entered New York Harbor Easter Sunday, 1787, while the bells of Trinity were calling the people to church.

[1] Smith: Life of Dr. Smith, vol. ii. pp. 450–466.
[2] Convention Journal of Va., 1787, May 19.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TWO EPISCOPACIES.

When Dr. Provoost returned to his work in Trinity Church, New York, and Dr. White to Christ Church, Philadelphia, commissioned to do the office and work of bishops, their presence completed the organization of a second Episcopal Church in America. Bishop Seabury had been at work in Connecticut for eighteen months. Rhode Island had placed herself under his ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Massachusetts and New Hampshire had asked for his episcopal oversight.

Thus the New England Church had been built up around the ecclesiastical idea which animated the ten clergymen at Woodbury. The Federal idea had prevailed in the other States, but had stopped in its eastward progress at the Housatonic. Can the two Churches, so diverse in sentiment, traditions, and ideals, ever coalesce? The future of American Episcopacy is involved in the issue.

The two Episcopal Churches.

Union seemed to be impossible. Their principles were antagonistic in essentials, and, what is far more potent in affecting action, their passions were deeply moved. In the East they were Tories; in the South they were Whigs. It was a time when political feeling was running higher than it has ever since done, with the

single exception of the period immediately preceding the Civil War.[1] A band of well-known gentlemen of position and standing had just vowed to murder Alexander Hamilton for only demanding common humanity in the treatment of Tories.[2] The laymen in the South could not forget that Bishop Seabury had been a British partisan, a British chaplain, and that his name was still borne on the rolls of the British army, in which he was yet receiving the pay of a retired officer, — a place which he kept till the day of his death.[3] Bishop Provoost entertained against him an implacable hostility, which he took no pains to conceal. He introduced into the convention of 1786 a resolution declaring Seabury's bishopric invalid,[4] in which he expressed the general sentiment of the New York clergy.

Obstacles to union.

The New England people, on their part, were distrustful of the whole spirit of the Federal Church. They did not believe its leaders to be sound in the faith; and were sure of their unsoundness in Churchmanship. The place given to laymen in the Church's government by the new constitution seemed to them a subversion of ecclesiastical order and Catholic custom. The proposed Prayer-Book was abhorrent to them. It was a monstrosity. It emptied the Sacraments of all meaning, overturned ancient and venerable use, and trampled upon traditions. In doctrine the antagonism

[1] McMaster: History of the United States, vol. i. p. 128.
[2] Morse: Life of Hamilton, vol. i. p. 149.
[3] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 120.
[4] Norton: Life of Bishop Provoost, p. 134.
[4] White: Memoirs, p. 161.

seemed to be still greater. The Convention had ruthlessly thrown out the two chief symbols of the Faith, and mutilated the third. To be sure, they had restored the Nicene Creed, but the motive under which they replaced it was, if possible, worse than the one which had led to its omission. The Convention, in their view, were so unmindful of the awful prescription of the Creed that they were ready to strike it out for a caprice, and to restore it to gain the end they sought in England. What reason was there to believe that such Churchmen would ever become comfortable yokefellows with the sons of the New England converts, and the spiritual brethren of the Nonjurors? A federated Episcopacy was an idle and dangerous dream.

So convinced were the Connecticut clergy of this, and so angered were they by the tone of their neighbors, that they set about to complete their own structure and make it permanently independent. They had one bishop; to be completely equipped, they would need two more. The ancient and wise custom of assuring against hasty consecration by requiring at least three bishops to join in every such act was recognized by both churches. The Connecticut clergy chose Dr. Jarvis to go to Scotland to the Nonjurors, as Dr. Seabury had done.[1] This would provide two. For the third they moved the clergy of Massachusetts to choose Dr. Parker of Boston, who, if chosen, might pursue the same course. In that event a New England hierarchy would be established in affiliation with the Scotch Church. Its high Churchmanship and

Plans to perpetuate the division.

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 77.

its soundness in the traditional faith would be guaranteed in advance. Fortunately the scheme failed, and America was spared the pragmatic Church which would thus have risen. Closely related as it would have been with the impracticable Nonjurors, and out of sympathy with the political movement of American life, it would have survived as a standing warning against Episcopacy. But the danger of such an attempt being made was very real. Through Bishops Seabury and White it was averted. Seabury's clear grasp of the nature of the Episcopal office led him to see that the *solidarity* of the Episcopate in a national Church must be maintained. Other bishops were now present in America, and, let the estrangement from them and theirs be what it might, the fact must be recognized. He was quite alive to the political dislike in which he and his were held. He was still more alive to the laxity of the Federal Convention in doctrine and discipline; but he also saw the imperative need of union. Putting aside all personal considerations, he wrote to the newly made bishops a letter of greeting and Godspeed. He offered them his brotherly hand. He assured them of his sympathy in their hope for a united Church; that he would work with them to that end; that he would be glad to meet with them as bishops at any time and place to consult of the matter; and invited them to be present at the Convocation to meet at Stamford in the coming Whitsuntide. Up to this time his difficulty had been that there was no power in the Federal Church with which he could negotiate. Now there was: and to this power he offered his memo-

Striving for unity.

randum. Bishop Provoost could hardly bring himself even to make a courteous reply to the proffer of the Tory ex-chaplain. But Bishop White was quick to seize such an opportunity to further the federation. He replied that union was the prime object in his mind, as it had always been; that if the changes in the Prayer-Book were the obstacle, he himself would be the first man to have them modified; but, he states frankly, if the Connecticut people insist that the constitution be changed so as to lodge all power in the Episcopate, and to dislodge the lay order from practical share in Church government, then negotiation will be hopeless; in that case the most which could be hoped for would be that the Scotch-American and English-American Churches might live side by side as friendly neighbors.[1] This letter seems to mark the lowest point of Bishop White's hopefulness. What with Bishop Provoost's savage Whiggery, the Virginia laymen's partisan feeling, and the quiet reluctance of the Connecticut clergy, the task seemed hopeless.

As the Eastern clergy had sought for Dr. Parker of Boston to fill up the nonjuring triad, so Bishop White now sought for him to complete the English complement. Dr. Griffith was still detained in Virginia by his poverty. Dr. Smith of Maryland, the other bishop-elect, was not improving either in temper or reputation, and, in any case, a quiet determination not to accept him is evident at every point.[2] So he also sought the Boston rector for the third, partly on account of his high charac-

[1] Bishop White's letter, quoted by Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 80.
[2] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 79.

ter, and partly as a strategic move to detach from Connecticut the State which was likely to be her first ally.

Dr. Parker's scheme.

But the astute Parker had a project of his own. He had no notion of going for consecration to either London or Aberdeen; indeed, he did not want the office at all. But he did want the unity of the Church. To effect this he cooked a plan which put all the bishops in a corner. Through his management the few clergy in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, who had no great need or any wish for a bishop, decided to choose Dr. Bass of Newburyport for that office, and to send a formal request to all three Bishops now in the States to unite in his consecration. This, he thought, they could not, with any face, refuse to do. But if they should do it, then mutual recognition and practical unity would be an accomplished fact. Organic unity would come as a result.

Convention of 1789.

While the situation stood thus the time came for the Convention to meet at Philadelphia in July, 1789. The presentation of the request of the Massachusetts people for the consecration of Dr. Bass brought up the whole question of the relation of the Churches. Could Connecticut and the Federal Bishops unite in this act? If not, why not? The issue was now, thanks to Dr. Parker, squarely before the Church, and must be disposed of. Bishop Seabury, though not present, was known to be willing to act. It was not thought that Bishop Provoost, also absent, would stand out against any agreement which might be reached. But the difficulty now was with Bishop White.[1] He

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 28.

would be only too glad, personally, to join in the consecration, but he felt that a tacit promise had been given to the English Bishops that no such action would be taken in this country till the full complement of three in their line should be present. It was true that no such explicit promise had been given, but then the Act of Parliament under which he and Provoost had been consecrated provided for three bishops, and it had only been through the accident of Dr. Griffith's detention that this had not been done. Besides this, and still more weighty, was the fact that the Scotch nonjuring Church, from which Seabury derived his Episcopate, was not recognized by the English Church.[1] Bishop White questioned whether two bishops of that line here ought to venture officially to do what the whole English Church would not do at home.

Bishop White and the English succession.

The result of the deliberation was the adoption of a set of resolutions, which, it was believed, would harmonize all conflicting interests. They are a model of Christian temper and sagacity.

The *first* resolution declares it to be the sense of the Convention that there subsists now in the United States "a complete order of bishops, derived as well under the English as the Scots line of Episcopacy."[2] This recognized the validity of Dr. Seabury's consecration in the independent judgment of the American Episcopal Church.

The *second* expands the first, and applies it: — these

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 163.
[1] Grub: Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, vol. iii. p. 370.
[2] White: Memoirs, p. 396.

three Bishops have all the power which belongs to the office in respect of discipline, limited only by such canons as the entire Church may fix.

The *third* declares that these powers should be exercised in the interest of the Church in any State which may need and require their use.

The *fourth* explicitly requests Bishops Provoost and White to join with Bishop Seabury in the consecration of Dr. Bass.

The *fifth* takes account of the difficulty in the way, and promises to address the English Bishops to have it removed, in case it should really exist, of which there is reason to doubt.

This settled one of the points of disagreement. Two others still remained. The Constitution already adopted did not give to the Episcopate a separate and independent authority, and did give the laity an integral place in the Church's government. This the Connecticut people opposed. In the second place, the Prayer-Book, as it had been changed, was obnoxious to them. The Convention now reconsidered both these actions so far as to leave them open to be rediscussed and acted upon by the united Church, in case the Connecticut people should come in.

Adjusting differences.

Having done so much and notified Connecticut of its action, it took a recess till the following September, to await the result. When September came, Bishop Seabury came also. The whole Episcopal Church in the United States being now represented, the disputed articles in the Constitution were brought before it. Upon the general principle of admitting the laity to a

place in the government, the Convention stood firm. They, however, modified somewhat the application of it, and safeguarded it against the possibilities of evil which Bishop Seabury apprehended.

Bishop Seabury's Toryism.

In the matter of the place of the Episcopate in the government, Bishop Seabury's Toryism was like to have wrecked the whole enterprise. The laymen could not get over that British half-pay of his. This hateful fact bulked so before their eyes that they could not see the ecclesiastical question at issue. Fortunately Bishop White, the well-known patriot, was able to take them aside and show them that "ecclesiastical bodies needed not to be over-righteous, or more so than civil bodies, on such a point;"[1] that this was a dead issue; that the half-pay was for services rendered long ago, and did not prevent him now being a good citizen of Connecticut; that he might even be returned to Congress from that State, and, if so, could take his seat with the half-pay in his pocket. The Bishop was able to persuade the Whig gentlemen to keep silence. The Constitution was changed to the extent of constituting the Bishops a separate House, only providing that a four-fifths vote of the other House might override their action. With this, Connecticut was fain to be content.

Adopting a Liturgy.

In the matter of a Liturgy, the Proposed Book found no one to say a good word for it. It was resolved that the point of departure should be the English Prayer-Book in common use; that it should be revised so as to bring it into harmony with the politi-

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 168.

cal status. These changes were made with care and caution. The Fourth of July service departed into obscurity with the book which contained it.

An Office for the Visitation of Prisoners, from the Irish Prayer-Book; the Thanksgiving Day Service from the Proposed Book; and a Form of Family Prayer were all adopted. The Convention would not accept the Athanasian Creed on any terms, though Bishop Seabury strenuously urged it. But it accepted at his hands the Prayers of Consecration from the Scotch Book.

These things being done, the Connecticut people formally gave in their adhesion; the two rival Churches ceased to strive; and there became one Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

Union.

CHAPTER V.

STRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT.

THE United States and the Protestant Episcopal Church were organized the same year and largely by the same hands. In both cases a Federal Government took the place previously occupied by a congress of independent States. The constitutional history of the Republic in the century which has succeeded has attracted many pens. A brief sketch of the Church's structural development becomes of interest.

In the experiment then begun, the State had an infinitely easier task than the Church. For a century and a half the States had been accustomed to self-government, to a large degree. Indeed, this was one of the political inheritances of the race. The town-meeting then, or even now, differs little from the folk-gatherings of the Germanic peoples two thousand years ago. In the political life the result of the Revolution did little more than transfer the rule from King and Parliament to President and Congress; it did not seriously change the subordinate machinery of government in the States, counties, and towns. To adjust the new Federal Constitution to the old political life was, therefore, not a difficult task, once men's passions had subsided.

In the Church, on the other hand, the new order of

things was revolutionary to an extent hard to conceive. It broke at a single stroke the traditions which had controlled Episcopacy for more than a thousand years. The Church, nowhere more than in England, had been accustomed to associate Episcopacy with Monarchy. Churchmen themselves were under the domination of this idea. For more than two centuries the *congé d'élire* of the king had been taken as authority in the choice of a bishop. Convocation had been silent for so many years that men had nearly forgotten its existence. Even when it did possess life it was not a popular body, deriving its authority from the people, but an agent whose powers, at the last analysis, were inherent in the State. In the long struggle between King and Parliament the people had gained the right, and ever since exercised the habit, of self-government in secular things; but in the same struggle the Church had stood by the King, and, in consequence, remained bound by the ancient fetters. So long had this continued that Churchmen had not only lost the habit, but also the wish, for independent action. The familiar forms of procedure whereby the people registered their votes, and made known their will in political things, were not the wont of the Church.

The experiment revolutionary.

From government by bishops, themselves the creatures of the king, to government by a convention made up of popularly selected bishops, priests, and laymen, is a tremendous leap. When the convention is composed of men who had been born and reared and had their habits fixed under another ecclesiastical system, the wonder at its success

Government by convention.

becomes still greater. It took long to disentangle this primitive Church revived from the traditions of the monarchical period. Reactionaries even yet dream of the time when Charles First was king.

Relation of the three orders.

The immediate task before the newly federated Church was to adjust the mutual relations of bishops, clergy, and laity. Each order had an independent voice in the management. How could they act harmoniously? The introduction of the laity into the place assigned to them was a momentous step. The ecclesiastical mind of New England was opposed to it entirely. Connecticut only came into the federal association upon the formal assurance that lay representation was but a *privilege* allowed to any State, which it might waive without suffering any diminution of its own strength in representation.[1] They accepted it as a privilege of doubtful wisdom, but sent lay delegates in 1792. Even after a century has elapsed they still exclude laymen from the Standing Committee. Upon the whole, however, this most revolutionary of the changes introduced became soonest accepted and fixed in a well-defined function.

The powers of bishops.

There was far more confusion as to the rights and powers of bishops. In the colonial days the absence of discipline was constantly deplored. It was absent because no bishop was present. A *simulacrum* of it appeared in the person of the Bishop

[1] "The Church in each State shall be *entitled* to a representation of clergy or laity or both. In case the Church of any State should neglect or decline to appoint these deputies of either order, or if it should be their rule to appoint only out of one order, the Church in such State shall nevertheless be considered to be duly represented . . . by either order." (Letter of Federal Convention to Bishop Seabury.)

of London's Commissary; but what power he possessed was recognized to be but delegated by his principal, in whom it inhered. Now that a bishop was on the ground, what rights and powers are his? How far may they be modified or restrained in action by the co-ordinate powers of clergy and laity in convention? In one form or other, this question has been before the American Church for a century. The general drift has been toward that undue limitation of their inherent powers which Bishop Seabury feared. Their unqualified power of "visitation" was at first conceded.[1] It was not only their right but their duty to make inquisition of the working of every minister in his cure; "to examine the state of his church and inspect the behavior of the clergy." The minister and church-wardens are charged to give their bishop the information he asks.[2] The Diocesan Convention has long since assumed this power. It is to it that such reports are now made, for information only, and not as a possible ground of discipline. The bishop's power of initiation in the exercise of clerical discipline, the power which by right and immemorial custom has always inhered in his office, has been almost, if not entirely, taken from him and lodged elsewhere.[3] The party offending is not now to be *summoned* by the bishop to give an account, but *presented* for trial, if any of his brethren volunteer this service, before a court from which the bishop is for the most part excluded.[4] In the matter

"Visitation."

[1] Canon iii. 1789.
[2] Canon xi. 1789.
[3] Gen. Con. Canons, Title II.
[4] Diocese of Pennsylvania. Canon xvii.

of ordination, the distinguishing function of the Episcopate, the same gradual process of restriction has occurred. The duty to select fit persons, and to pass upon their qualifications for the ministry, has always, by ancient usage, been lodged in the hands of the bishop in his capacity of chief pastor. Before the federation, Bishop Seabury exercised this power without question.[1] It was the same authority which had warranted the English bishops in ordaining him and the hundreds of others who had crossed the sea for that end in colonial times. There the bishop had not been hindered in his right to beget spiritual children. The convention at once set limits to episcopal discretion here. It precluded the bishop from laying hands on any man, unless he had reached a certain age, and had a field of work guaranteed; but this was only putting an old custom into the form of a law. Within these limits it left the bishop free to act. It provided for him an agent in the Standing Committee whose duty it would be to examine *for him* the candidates' fitness, but recognized his original power by the provision that "every candidate for Holy Orders shall be recommended according to . . . the requisites of the bishop to whom he applies."[2] But as time went on, the Standing Committee ceased to act as the bishop's agent,[3] and came to be regarded as having an independent authority of its own in the premises. Then a still more radical departure from its original

Encroachment by the Standing Committee.

[1] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 213.
[2] Canon vi. 1789.
[3] It was first called the "Bishops' Council of Advice."

function insensibly took place, and the Standing Committee came to be thought of as representing the clergy and laity! It is usually so regarded now. From being the bishop's creature, it has become the Diocesan Convention's representative. In this capacity a mixed body of clergymen and laymen now divides with the bishop the power of selecting fit persons for the ministry, and leaves him the power to ordain only such persons as it may think worthy.[1]

Power of House of Bishops increased.

While the power of bishops in their individual capacity has been steadily circumscribed, so that of the House of Bishops has been extended. The first provision was to give them only a seat *ex officio* among the other clergy. With this Bishop Seabury would in no wise be content. Then they were constituted a separate House with power to originate measures, but without an absolute negative upon the other House. The clergy and laity could pass any measure over their heads by a four-fifths vote, or through the bishops' failure to negative it within a limited period of two days.[2] Twenty years later both these restrictions upon independent action were removed, and the House of Bishops received the power which has often stood the Church in good stead.[3]

[1] Gen. Con. Canons, Title I. Canons 1–8.

Among the "Fundamental Rights and Liberties" laid down in the Convention of 1783, as the basis of federation, is the following: "The clergy shall be deemed adequate judges of the ministerial commission and authority, and of the literary, moral, and religious qualifications and abilities of persons to be nominated to the different orders of the ministry; but the approving and receiving such persons to any particular cure, duty, or parish, when so nominated, set apart, consecrated, and ordained, is in the people who are to support them, and to have the benefit of their ministry." White: Memoirs, p. 94.

[2] Constitution, 1789.

[3] Gen. Con. Journal, 1808.

This same tendency toward legal rather than personal authority shows itself also in the provision for the godly discipline of the laity. Virginia objected to the "Proposed Book" because it gave to the priest the power to repel unworthy persons from the Holy Communion. The sense of the united Church was so much the other way, however, that it not only allowed this power to the priests, but extended the latitude within which the book restricted it. The English rubric required the priest in such a cause to report the case to the Ordinary within fourteen days at the farthest. The American only required him to do so as soon as conveniently may be. The English rule required the bishop to institute an inquiry into the facts of every such case as soon as reported to him. The American says he need not do so unless the repelled person asks for such a trial in writing, within a fixed term, after which his case shall go by default. In such a cause the bishop, the priest, and the person repelled were the only parties. The bishop was at liberty "to proceed according to such principles of law and equity" as he might, and his judgment was final. But, as the spirit of government by convention gained sway, the personal authority of both bishop and priest was circumscribed. The Convention provided for a regular process of trial for a repelled communicant, either by its own canons, or by such as the Diocesan Conventions might adopt.[1] Diocesan Conventions drew the restrictions still closer, and, in some cases, set up mixed courts of clergy and laymen for such cases.[2]

Discipline of the laity.

[1] Canon xlii. 1832.
[2] Penna. Canon xviii.

The whole legal history of the Church, in fact, is but a record of the successive assumptions of power by the General Convention.

Control of the Liturgy.

From the outset the Liturgy was taken under its control. During the whole colonial period there had been great laxity in the use of the Prayer-Book. But few people possessed copies of it, and in public worship the "clerk" spoke for all the congregation. Beside that, there had been no power present to enforce uniformity. But the practice of the two hundred years since the English Church had avowed her settled purpose to bring all her members into one uniform mode of worship had produced its effect. The possibility of variety of use in the same National Church had ceased to be thought of. The Convention at once assumed unquestioned control in the matter, and set before itself uniformity as an end. In the early reports upon the "State of the Church," one item always records the extent to which this had been attained in each State.[1] The success was finally absolute. From Maine to California uniformity was exacted. When that had been achieved there came a reaction which threatened revolution. Ritual violations of law began to show themselves everywhere. They were quite as much rebellions against mechanical routine, as the outcome of strange doctrine. The next phase of the history is that long-drawn effort in which the Convention is now engaged, to stamp out the wide-spread insurrection against its law of ritual uniformity. Its sway in this regard was only

Tendency to uniformity.

[1] General Con. Journal, 1820.

achieved by persistent effort through half a century; a second half-century may see it overthrown or abdicated.

Hymns.

Over Hymns as well as Prayers, the Convention stretched out its hand. It early assumed the power to say what might be sung, and what might not. At a later date it set forth tunes as well, and with the same right. Nor has the assumption been generally questioned. Its power to authorize certain selections from religious poetry has been regarded as carrying with it the power to exclude all others.

It has not hesitated to take cognizance of the personal actions of individual clergymen, and to instruct them to keep away from one another's field of work. It has taken notice of the daily life of the laity, and prescribed rules for their personal conduct.[1]

Powers of General Convention.

The original Act of Association stipulated: "That no powers be delegated to a general ecclesiastical government, except such as cannot be conveniently exercised by the clergy and laity in their respective congregations." In a century the same "general ecclesiastical government" has gathered into its hands all authority. It would be difficult to say what it might not legally do. In the absence of any supreme ecclesiastical court to interpret the Constitution with authority, any local power to withstand its mandates, any authority to enforce the

[1] "All persons within this Church shall celebrate and keep the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, in hearing the Word of God read and taught, in private and public prayer, in other exercises of devotion, and in acts of charity, using all godly and sober conversation." Canon xlii. 1832.

terms of the original compact, there would seem to be no limit set to the Convention's power except its own will.[1]

State autonomy.

The parties to the original federation were the Churches in the several States. In the early years of the history these are uniformly thought and spoken of as possessing independent lives. The old ideal of National Churches was always present to the minds of the founders, but their thought of nationality attached itself to the independent State rather than to the federated Union. In fact, that federation was not yet accomplished, and there was grave reason to doubt if ever it would be. Virginia or Connecticut were far more substantial realities than was the United States. This way of thinking survived until a generation grew up under the flag of the Federal Union. Then it was seen that while State lines might be convenient boundaries for ecclesiastical dioceses, there was no necessary relation between the two things. The quality of nationality could not be claimed for an individual State to the extent which would warrant the inhabitants of it acting as a National Church. This quality had insensibly transferred itself to the Federal Union. When this fact came to be recognized, there was no principle to hinder the division of a State into convenient dioceses, or the grouping of several States into one ecclesiastical district.[2] But when this was done, and New York had been divided, the accepted

[1] Dr. Francis Wharton, in Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 400.

[2] "Address to the Clergy and Laity of the P. E. Church residing in the Western Part of the State of New York," 1835, p. 20.

principle of representation at once became indefensible. State autonomy had disappeared. The idea of diocesan autonomy had not yet emerged. The States had had an equal representation in convention allowed them from the first. But this was not from any idea of diocesan equality, but from the thought of each being a National Church. That principle being abandoned, an equal representation, regardless of numbers or strength, became at once inequitable. But the method had become intrenched in custom, and acquired the authority of prescription, and so it survived. It became only a question of time, however, as to when the Church should recognize the change in the fact, and bring her practice to conform thereto.

Gradually abandoned.

The same lust of legislation which led the Convention to regulate prayer, praise, and conduct, led it also to enact by law a detailed system of doctrine.

In the sixteenth century the Church of England had been coerced by the doctrinal spirit of the age to set forth a detailed body of divinity in her *Thirty-nine Articles*. The action was foreign to her genius. But the Romanists had their Tridentine formularies; the Lutherans their Augsburg Confession; the Calvinists the Westminster Confession, and the Church of England was driven by the *Zeitgeist* to become "like unto the nations." The adoption of such a detailed system of theology was contrary to her history and traditions. The Confession remained in her body like a foreign substance, irritating, until it became encysted and forgotten. When the American Church was organized it had a chance to rectify

The Articles, and their origin.

the error. A wish widely prevailed to omit the Articles altogether. Their importance was deemed so subsidiary that they were set aside until all else was settled. Then the question came up, Shall this Church formulate a body of doctrine? Shall it exact subscription thereto? In 1799 the question was brought forward concerning the Articles. These had not been bound up with the Prayer-Books which had been used in America for more than a generation. They had been thought of as standing upon the same ground that the Homilies did, and were little, if at all, known by the people.[1] The Convention went into Committee of the Whole upon the subject. When it rose the chairman reported the following, which they had agreed upon: "*Resolved*, That the articles of our faith and religion as founded on the Holy Scriptures are sufficiently declared in our Creeds and our Liturgy as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, established for the use of this Church, and that further articles do not appear necessary."

Unfortunately, the House saw fit to vote against the resolution[2] which it had just agreed to in committee. The Bishops were in favor of adopting the Articles. Two years later, some political modifications having been made, they were adopted as a whole. They were ordered to be bound up with the Prayer-Book in all future editions. No formal subscription to them was prescribed. There they have stood since. What binding force upon belief they may

Their binding force.

[1] Letter from a Churchman to His Friend in New Haven, 1808, p. 29.
[2] Con. Journal, June 14, 1799.

carry, each decides for himself. They are a section of sixteenth-century thought transferred to the nineteenth. They have never exercised any appreciable influence upon the life or belief of this Church. Like all contemporary Confessions, they have largely ceased to be intelligible. They are a water-mark of a previous tide. The current of the Church has flowed on unmindful of them. The last revision of the Prayer-Book provides for their being bound up next its cover; the next will probably bind them outside.

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW.

Between 1790 and the close of the War of 1812, a profound change occurred in America. It was the passage from colonial to modern life. The Revolution had made it necessary and cleared the way for it. The Federal Constitution had fixed the lines of its ultimate development. The Protestant Episcopal Church was equipped to keep step with it. But the mature men of 1790 had been reared in a social, religious, and commercial environment as different from that into which their sons emerged when they took the management of affairs, as could well be imagined. The fathers, both in Church and State, had been wise builders. But they were as little at home in the house which they had erected as is the plain and successful man of business in the splendid mansion which he builds for his children after he has made his fortune. The Revolutionary men were too old to adjust themselves easily to the new *régime*. That compelled the abandonment of old customs, and prejudices still more close-clinging than custom. Wigs were laid aside. The sword, heretofore the badge of a gentleman, ceased to be carried. Distinctions of social rank were beginning to fade, to the great disturbance of them of the *ancien régime*.

Change of manners.

The formal manners of the colonial period were passing away, and the sharp, business-like intercourse of modern times was coming in.[1] The bishops and statesmen who were to the fore at the beginning of the period were men of the old school. Those whom we shall see at its end were modern men. The change from the old order to the new led through an unhappy and turbulent epoch. In its turmoils the men of clear vision, sagacious mind, and strong hand, who had fought a battle against odds, cemented the State, founded a Nation, and organized a Church, one by one dropped out of sight. It seemed as though the titanic task they had accomplished had drained their energies. One of the most brilliant epochs in the history of the American people is followed closely by one of the darkest. The body politic and the body ecclesiastic seemed exhausted after the strain of the great effort for independence. Disorders of all sorts broke out in the depleted system. Virulent party strife racked it with pains. Federalist and anti-Federalist assailed each other with a rancor unknown in modern politics. No name was so great and no character so high as to bring its owner safety. Washington was called a "fool by nature," and Franklin a "fool by old age." Scurrilous pamphlets, abounding in personalities, pasquinades, and libellous newspaper articles were the least objectionable of the weapons used.[1] When these were not violent enough, clubs and smallswords took their places. Both parties agreed in attacking what they thought the

Old men and new times.

[1] Johnson: History of the U.S., p. 167.

[1] M'Master: History of the U.S., vol. i. ch. 5.

shameful extravagance of Congressmen. States wrangled about the ownership of the public lands, and while they argued, land-jobbers stole them.[1] Debate ran fierce and high about slavery. The smallpox devastated New England, and the yellow-fever threatened to depopulate Philadelphia and New York. A shameful panic seized the people. Ties of nature and of affection were disregarded, and each man thought only of himself. The horrid selfishness of fear demoralized the populace. The Indians broke out against the frontiersmen on the Ohio and the Maumee. Harmer and St. Clair were beaten by their savage enemies, and it looked as though the movement westward would be stayed at the Ohio. Algerine pirates seized upon the ships of the new nation and sold their crews into a hopeless slavery. Speculation ran rife. Even city councils took to gambling. Drunkenness threatened to debauch the nation. In the Western settlements whiskey was the only currency used. A tax on its manufacture raised an insurrection which it required the national resources to suppress. In 1810 there were fourteen thousand distilleries in the country, producing two and a half gallons of raw spirits annually for every person in the population, a rate never since reached.[2] The subsiding animosity against England and all things English was fanned into a new flame by the terms of the British Treaty and the hateful Tory claims.[3] "M'Fingal," a satire upon the Tories, after the manner

A dark epoch.

[1] Hawks: Ecclesiastical Contributions, vol. Va., Appendix, p. 81.
[2] Schouler: History of the U.S., vol. ii.
[3] Ib., vol. i. pp. 456, 459.

of "Hudibras," was in every hand and upon every tongue.[1]

French infidelity.

It was the period dominated by French infidelity. The service rendered the Americans by Lafayette and his compatriots during the war had won the people's heart. France seemed to promise a sister republic. Previous to the reaction caused by the atrocities of the French Revolution, French manners were all the rage. Talleyrand, the apostate Bishop of Autun, De Noailles, Rochefoucauld, Louis Philippe himself, were honored guests. The tri-colored cockade was the favorite decoration. The shallow atheism which led the French to abolish God by decree was widespread here. Jefferson was its scarcely disguised apostle. Tom Paine became its champion. His "Age of Reason," published in 1794, had a circulation and an influence hardly equalled by any single book since.[2] Its succinct, portable, and specious, even if shallow, arguments commended it to the thousands who were already under the influence of the same spirit from which it emanated, and were delighted to find arguments placed in their mouths. Especially in the South and West did this prevail. The days of Christianity were thought to be numbered, and a reign of "Reason" was at hand. Like the Ingersollism of a later date, it was welcomed by the half educated, who wished the freedom from moral restraints which it

[1] Trumbull: "M'Fingal," now only remembered by its surviving couplet, —

"No rogue e'er felt the halter draw,
With good opinion of the law."

[2] Hildreth: History of the U.S., vol. ii. p. 464.

carried with it. When Jefferson was chosen President, it seemed to have triumphed utterly. Presidents have been elected since who have sat loosely to the Christian faith, but not before or since Jefferson who have been voted for on that ground.[1]

It was a period prolific of sects. Specially in the West and South a brood of them was born. The sober Presbyterianism which the Scotch-Irish had lately carried into Tennessee and Kentucky was overwhelmed by the wave of revivalism which reached its height in this period.[2] Upon its ruins arose a growth of extravagant churches, so called, destined afterward to fill the valley of the Ohio.

Position of the Church.

What could the newly organized Church do in such an age? The devastation of war, the fury of political strife, the revived animosity to England and all things English, the craze of French infidelity, the unsettling of fixed habits, the loosening of creeds, the weakening of reverence, all wrought against her growth.

By the happy union of the New England and the Federal ideas in the ecclesiastical constitution, signed by all the States in 1789, the Church had escaped the peril of permanent schism, not to say of anarchy. Upon the death of poor Dr. Griffith, Virginia chose Dr. Madison, who went to England for consecration, and thus completed the English line. Both lines combined in consecrating Dr. Claggett Bishop of Mary-

[1] Centennial Council, Va., p. 139.
[1] Chase: Reminiscences, vol. i. p. 108.
[2] Roosevelt: Winning of the West, vol. i. p. 133.
[2] Hildreth: History of the U.S., vol. ii. p. 463.

land. South Carolina, which had only entered the Federal Church on the condition that no bishop should be sent to her, came to a better mind three years later, and elected Dr. Robert Smith. Massachusetts, the Eastern Diocese, and New Jersey followed. To complete the organization was thenceforth an easy task. The real problem was how to set the enginery of the Church into efficient motion. For a brief period it seemed as though success would be immediate. Multitudes flocked to Confirmation. Bishop Seabury confirmed two hundred and fifty at one time[1] at Stratford, and nearly twice as many at Waterbury. At Bishop Provoost's first Confirmation at Trinity Church, over three hundred presented themselves. They included children of fourteen, and tottering old men and women, who went from the chancel to their pews muttering their *Nunc Dimittis*. Two venerable ladies were led up by their colored slaves, who stood humbly by until the rite was over.[2] Bishop Madison, at his first and only visitation to the tide-water section of his State, confirmed six hundred in five parishes.[3] But when the novelty of the rite, now for the first time made possible, had worn away, it became very generally neglected. Bishop White does not seem to have deemed Confirmation more essential for the people than he had deemed it for himself. He had never been confirmed at all. He rarely made visitations outside of Philadelphia and the towns close by.[4]

Numbers confirmed.

[1] Beardsley: History of the Church in Connecticut, vol. i. p. 430.
[2] Norton: Life of Bishop Provoost, p. 132.
[3] Centennial Council, Va., p. 140.
[4] Rev. Dr. J. H. Hopkins, in The Churchman, April 22, 1884.

He never crossed the mountains but once. The many Church people who had made their homes in Western Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Eastern Kentucky were entirely neglected.[1] A convocation of clergy assembled in 1801 at Washington, Pa., coming from these districts, wrote to Bishop White, asking that something might be done to organize the Church in the West, but, after waiting eighteen months for an answer, were told that nothing could be done. Bishop White does not give any account at all of his Episcopal work until 1809. During the twenty years which succeed, his visitations averaged only six parishes per annum. In the twelve parishes beyond the Alleghanies, Confirmation was never seen but once in his long Episcopate. Indeed he protests in set terms against "the supposition in the minds of many, that a bishop should always be engaged in visitations."[2] He declares that it is contrary to the usage of diocesan bishops in all ages; that a bishop's time is "as much due to his own family as are any of his services to the Church;" that it is inconsistent with a learned Episcopacy; that it would be oppressive upon an aged and infirm bishop. The bishops were all rectors of parishes,[3] and regarded the work of their Episcopal office but little, except in the single function of ordination. Bishop Madison, after his first visitation, paid no further attention to his diocese, but occupied himself entirely

Slack administration.

[1] Rev. Dr. J. H. Hopkins, in The Churchman, April 22, 1884.

[2] White: Memoirs, p. 467.

[3] Virginia, from fear that the bishop might come to be considered different from the other clergy, passed a canon compelling him to be rector of a parish.

[3] Hawks: Contributions, vol. Va., p. 214.

with his duties as President of William and Mary College.[1] The first Bishop of South Carolina never confirmed at all.[2] After his death, no successor was chosen for eleven years. Bishop Provoost resigned in 1801, and busied himself with making a new translation of Tasso, and the study of botany.[3] During this time he entirely neglected the services of the Church and the Holy Communion.[4] The convention of his diocese met irregularly. During three successive years it did not meet at all.[5] The coadjutor, Bishop Moore, proceeded in the same easy fashion, commending the Church, however, as Provoost did not, by his own gentle piety. In 1811 he was stricken with paralysis. Dr. Hobart was thereupon chosen the third Bishop of New York, all three of whom were living at the same time. The situation caused great searchings of heart. The interest, however, did not revolve about the problem of the Church's progress, but of her internal arrangement. We first catch a glimpse here of the party spirit destined later to convulse the Church, and see an exhibition of that pettiness which has always been her besetting sin. The "Low Churchmen" were bitterly opposed to Dr. Hobart's election. Bishop Provoost, to the general amazement, laid down his lexicons, closed his herbariums, and came out to head the opposition. He declared that his resignation ten years earlier had not been irrevocable. He proposed now to assume the

Troubles in New York.

[1] Norton: Life of Bishop Provoost, p. 174.
[2] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 189, *note*.
[3] Sprague: Annals, vol. v. p. 244.
[4] Perry: History, vol. i. p. 190.
[5] Norton: Life of Bishop Provoost, p. 168.

administration himself, and would not require the services of the bishop-elect. His contention was so preposterous that the House of Bishops would not hear of it, and even his own convention would not allow it. Dr. Hobart must be consecrated. But when the day fixed for the ceremony arrived, the deplorable weakness of the Church appeared. There were six bishops in the United States. Three were necessary to consecrate another. Bishop Provoost was broken in health, and his naturally infirm temper was weakened by the transaction of which this ceremony formed the conclusion. It was very doubtful if he either could or would be present. Bishop Madison of Virginia was so indifferent to the whole affair that he did not think of leaving his college duties for such a purpose. Bishop Claggett of Maryland was taken ill on his way North, and obliged to turn back. Only Bishops White of Pennsylvania and Jarvis of Connecticut were available. It looked as though another journey must be made to England for consecration. That would indeed have been easier than to secure the attendance of three American bishops at one time and place. Finally Bishop Provoost consented to join in the consecration if his health would allow him to go to the church. The other bishops then agreed that if he should be unable, the service might be held in his bed-chamber. Fortunately he found the strength and the will to attend at Trinity Church. But upon his arrival a great difficulty arose. He had adorned his head with a wig, and the other bishops wore only their hair. It was solemnly discussed whether or not so important a function could be

The question of wigs.

performed wigless.[1] Dr. Duché offered to lend Bishop White his for the occasion. But Bishop Jarvis, in that case, would be singular. Bishop White adduced the high example of Archbishop Tillotson, whose portrait shows him wigless. This illustrious precedent was deemed satisfactory for the two, while Bishop Provoost should uphold ancient usage in his Episcopal headdress. The question being settled, the services proceeded, and the three surviving men of the old order laid their hands upon Bishop Hobart, the first of modern Churchmen.

State of things in the South.

Throughout the South and the frontier the condition of things was no better. Between Virginia and South Carolina lay a broad belt of settlements where parishes had once been, and where many Church families were scattered yet. Among the population which was pouring over the Cumberland Mountains into Kentucky and Tennessee there were hundreds of Episcopalians from Maryland and Virginia. These were all as sheep without a shepherd, and were, for the most part, lost finally to the Church.[2] In the two old States where the Church had been established, destruction was abroad. The loss of the State support, upon which they had become accustomed to lean, left them broken in fortune and in spirit. In Maryland, party strife added the last touch to the dark picture. When Bishop Claggett grew infirm, and Dr. Kemp was chosen for his assistant, a secession took place, under the lead of Rev. Daniel Dashiell, of Balti-

[1] Norton: Life of Bishop Provoost, p. 176.
[2] Id.: Life of Bishop Claggett, p. 110.

more, and an "Evangelical Episcopal Church" set up.[1] The abortive schism never effected more than to harass the already wearied Church. The dawn of a better day was even then visible.

Low estate in Virginia.

But it was in old Virginia where the gloom was deepest. The Church had been in control there for two centuries, until within a generation. But that generation had turned away from her in indifference or in anger. During the war, her laymen, the Washingtons, Henrys, Lees, Pendletons, had taken the patriotic side, while the clergy had clung to England and to their glebes. When the new order of things came in, the Church's power was foredoomed. In the judgment of the people it had been misused, and they meant to take it away entirely. The laymen stood by impassive, or joined in the spoliation. In 1802 the blow fell, and the Church's property was swept away at a stroke. Glebes and churches were sold for a song.[2] The proceeds, which, it had been enacted by the Legislature, should be "used for any public purpose not religious," were embezzled by the sheriff's officers. Guzzling planters toped from stolen chalices and passed the cheese about in patens. A marble font became a horse-trough. Communion plate, the gift of the good Queen Anne, adorned the sideboards of officers of State and country gentlemen. The clergy in large numbers laid down their spiritual callings. At the outbreak of the war they had numbered ninety. At its close, only

[1] Hawks: Contributions, vol. Md., p. 422.
[2] Ib., vol. Va., p. 224 *et seq.*
[2] Centennial Council, Virginia, p. 70.

twenty-eight could be counted. After the spoliation they lost all heart. No convention was held from 1806 to 1812. Then only thirteen could be assembled. When they adjourned it was with no expectation of ever meeting again.[1] "They fear," said the House of Deputies to the Bishop, "the Church in Virginia is so depressed that there is danger of her utter ruin." The people had already gone from her. The Rev. Devereux Jarratt declares that before the Revolution he had often nine hundred or a thousand communicants; now, since the Methodists have done their work, he can scarcely find forty hearers.

Meade ordained.

When William Meade was ordained deacon at Williamsburg, in 1811, two ladies and fifteen gentlemen, most of them his relatives, formed the congregation. The citizens were filling their ice-houses, and the students, with their dogs and guns, had gone hunting. The church was dilapidated and the windows broken. There were grave suspicions that the Bishop himself had renounced the Christian faith.[2] The literary society of the college had lately discussed: First, Whether there be a God? Secondly, Whether the Christian religion had been injurious or beneficial to mankind? Infidelity was then rife in the State, and the College of William and Mary was regarded as the hotbed of French politics and religion. "I can truly say," says Bishop Meade, "that then, and for some years after, in every educated young man whom I met, I expected to find a sceptic, if not an unbeliever." No

[1] Centennial Council, Virginia, p. 143.
[2] Meade: Old Churches, vol. i. pp. 29–30.

minister had been ordained for years save one unworthy fellow, and it was a passing wonder to the people that a young man of good family, an educated man, a graduate of Princeton, should enter the ministry of the Episcopal Church![1]

The Church in New England.

In Connecticut, indeed throughout New England, the Church maintained its own, but made scant progress. Bishop Seabury took his office seriously. He was strong in the thing, but lacked grace in the manner. "I, Samuel, by Divine permission Bishop of Connecticut, . . . issue this *injunction*, hereby authorizing and requiring you, and every one of you, the Presbyters and Deacons of the Church above mentioned, to make the following alterations in the Liturgy and Offices of the Church."[2] This was his style toward those who recognized his authority. In an "Address to Ministers and Congregations of the Presbyterian and Independent persuasions in the United States of America," he charges them to return to the fold. This could only be done by "relinquishing those errors which they, through prejudice, had imbibed." This sort of treacle catches few flies. On the other hand, his clear and emphatic presentation of the position of the Church had its effect upon a people who have always been moved by argument rather than by feeling. But even in New England a new hostility had arisen. The old charge of lack of spiritual earnestness had been revived.[3] A con-

Bishop Seabury's manner.

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 143.

[2] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 386.

[3] Character and Principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church Vindicated: New Haven, 1816.

certed attempt, in which the Puritan clergy joined, to damage her prospects and reputation, had been systematically undertaken.[1]

Dr. Coke's proposition.

It seems unfortunate that it should have fallen to the bishops of this period to meet and pass upon one of the most momentous questions which have ever been brought before that house. This was a proposition from Dr. Coke, the first of the Methodist superintendents. He had been set apart by Wesley in 1784, and had himself commissioned Mr. Asbury in America to complete the organization of that numerous body, then members of the Episcopal Church. After some years of work and experience, Coke, still a clergyman of the Church, wrote to the new-made Bishops Seabury and White, offering a plan of reunion. He proposed that he and Mr. Asbury should be consecrated "as bishops of the Methodist Society in the United States (or by any other title, if that be not proper), on the supposition of the union of the two churches, under proper mutual stipulation." Bishop Seabury never answered his letter at all.[2] Bishop White replied in his usual courteous style. Bishop Madison of Virginia, who knew better than any of the others who and what the Methodists were, and what their needs were, was anxious that the matter should be accomplished, but the other bishops were untouched. Bishop Seabury did not want it, and Bishop White did not believe it possible.[3] They dismissed the project

[1] Letter from a Churchman to his Friend in New Haven, 1808.
[2] Beardsley: Life of Seabury, p. 401.
[3] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 126.

with a general declaration that the Church was always desirous of unity, was ready to alter or modify anything save essentials to this end, and recommended to the several States to propose such conferences with Christians of other denominations as they might think most prudent.

Methodists gone beyond recall.

At first sight it would seem as though the Church had lost the opportunity of the century through the incapacity of the old bishops to comprehend the new condition of things. Could they have foreseen the mighty ecclesiastical empire to which American Methodism was destined to grow, they would doubtless have laid aside all else, and striven to avert its final separation from its mother. The severance has been fruitful of evil to both mother and child. But it is doubtful if they could have succeeded. It was even then too late. Had the Bishop of London hearkened to Wesley's earnest prayer a dozen years before, and ordained men to look after the thousands of Methodists who were then members of the Bishop's own flock, the division would probably have been averted. But he had refused, and the mischief was done. Wesley's action in sending out superintendents had been well and wisely done. It was the action of a High Churchman [1] and an earnest man. There was no bishop here then, and, so far as men could see, no likelihood of any. Meanwhile "the hungry sheep looked up and were not fed." That the superintendents should take upon themselves the office of bishop, whether they assumed its title or not, was inevitable. No chagrin of Wesley could change the course of events. He had,

[1] Stevens: History of Methodism, Appendix.

with an honest purpose, built an engine which he could not control; but the first American bishops were not the men to either control or direct it. Their great work was done. It had been to organize American Episcopacy. That they had done well and wisely. To bring it into right relation with the other component parts of American Christianity was to be the duty of their descendants a century later.

Dawning of a better day.

As the chaotic period now before us draws to its end, signs of new vigor in the Church begin to appear. A generation of men born and reared under the new order are now coming upon the stage. The field is being prepared by a hundred unthought-of agencies. The unpopular war with England in 1812 has ended, and a better understanding exists than did when it began. Churchmen had fought on the American side, and had won their comrades' good-will. Napoleon's duplicity has disgusted the people with the French influence. The Cumberland Road has been built from the Potomac to the Ohio and beyond. Canals have been opened up to carry emigrants and goods. The vast region east of the Mississippi has been purchased. Wayne has broken and scattered the Indians. Settlers' cabins have begun to dot the prairies. Lewis and Clark have toiled up the Missouri, and paddled down the Columbia. Fulton's new steamboat has carried wondering passengers up the Hudson, and its sister craft has been built on the Ohio. Manufactories have crossed the Alleghanies. The cotton gin has started new life in the South. A highway has been cast up. The old life has gone. The modern America has come.

With it have come new men. Bishop Hobart is impressing the true spirit of the American Church upon New York and Connecticut. Meade is gathering up the scattered and broken forces in Virginia. Empie and Judd are laying foundations in North Carolina. The sagacious Parker is adjusting the Church to the new life in Massachusetts. The outlying provinces to the northward have been gathered into the Eastern Diocese, and Bishop Griswold is doing apostolic work there. That adventurous missionary and builder, Philander Chase, has organized a congregation at New Orleans, and has come home to prepare for his strange career in the Ohio valley. An Episcopal Academy has been founded in Philadelphia, and another in Connecticut. The Virginia Churchmen are moving to establish a theological seminary.[1] The "Advancement Society" is beginning its work among the frontiersmen. A similar society in New York is sustaining a mission among the Oneidas and Mohawks. Bishop Hobart confirms eighty-nine Indians at one visitation, and ninety-seven at another.[2] His scheme for a theological seminary at New York is about to be realized through the generous gift of a layman, Jacob Sherred. Tract societies, Bible societies, Prayer-Book societies, have been founded, and a Church newspaper is started.[3] Dr. Hobart puts forth his "Companion for the Altar," and defends Church order in the Albany Centinel against the Dutch Reformed Dr. Linn

New men at work.

Representative men.

[1] Centennial Council, Va., p. 79.
[2] Norton: Life of Bishop Hobart, pp. 56, 83.
[3] Ib., p. 43.

and the Presbyterian Samuel Miller. In his "Apology for Apostolic Order" he gained an honorable place for the theory of Episcopacy in the controversial world. Churchmen were coming to the front in American literature, as they had a generation before in statesmanship, and as they were even now in law. Chief Justice Marshall and Chancellor Kent stood foremost in their profession. Gulian C. Verplanck, Irving, Cooper, and Richard Henry Dana brought a new and broader life to American letters.

The Bishops of the new *régime* make diligent and regular visitations. In some States an Episcopal Fund has been begun, and the Bishop is, in part at least, set free from the engrossing cares of a parish. The multifarious machineries for parochial work are not yet thought of. The Sunday-school is seen in the process of its evolution. As yet it is upon trial, and is more a secular than a religious device. In an Anniversary Address in 1817,[1] Bishop Hobart offers a lengthy defence of the plan to teach a modicum of Church doctrine, as distinguished from the "non-sectarian" instruction then in use. The report of the society before which he speaks shows that up to that time there had been published for the Sunday-schools in the city 8,000 alphabet cards; 2,000 spelling-books; 740 primers; 167 Prayer-books; that several women over sixty had learned to spell quite well; that twelve classes of colored children had learned to read in words of one syllable; that, in the February before, Grace Church had started a school in

Beginning of Sunday-schools.

[1] Anniversary of the New York Sunday-school Society, 1818.

which fourteen gentlemen had come forward as teachers, and they had opened with twenty scholars; that the society hopes soon to issue 2,000 Scripture Lessons, being Bishop Gastrell's "Christian Institutes, a Compleat System of the Doctrines and Precepts of the Gospel, in a Connected Series of Scripture Texts;" that they have collected eight hundred dollars, of which two hundred dollars has been paid as salaries to superintendents, and for desks, while the balance is on hand; that they venture to think the success for the year a convincing argument in favor of the new institution.[1]

State of the Church in 1820.

The General Convention Journal for 1820 gives a comprehensive view of the state of the Church. It reports that in Maine, "where for many years it was depressed and almost extinct," it "has now assumed a flourishing aspect;" that in New Hampshire there are nine churches; in Massachusetts it is flourishing, the Canons and Rubrics are generally observed, a large and elegant new church is nearly completed in Boston, and "a few small congregations have been collected in other towns;" in Vermont three new churches have been built, some new congregations have been gathered, and a suit has been entered to secure the *demesnes;* the Church in Rhode Island is flourishing, and "there is a decided and increasing attachment to the peculiarities of our Communion;" "in Connecticut no material change has taken place;" in New York the growth has been phenomenal, — twenty-four priests ordained and fourteen deacons, and thirty-six clergy have undertaken work in

[1] New York Sunday-school Society, Report for 1818.

the State within the last three years; in New Jersey the "Church continues slowly to improve," eight Confirmations have been held in the last three years; in Pennsylvania it "is increasing as rapidly as, when all circumstances are considered, we have any reason to expect;" in Delaware "the state of affairs is certainly improving;" in Maryland is every sign of a new life, and it is recorded as noteworthy that the Bishop has visited nearly every church within the last three years; in Virginia the improvement has been greater still, there are now fifty clergy, and "the conduct of the communicants is more consistent;" in North Carolina the communicants have grown from fifty to more than three hundred; in South Carolina there are signs of a new life; from the remote region of Ohio little information has come, but several congregations are known to have been gathered, one at Dayton and one at Miami, at the least.[1]

[1] Gen. Con. Journal, 1820.

CHAPTER VII.

WAITING FOR VOLUNTEERS.

"THE Report of the Committee on the State of the Church" for 1820 shows that it was then organized in all the original States. There were not yet bishops in all, but the scattered congregations in each had drawn together. In one instance, several separate States had confederated into a temporary diocese, with the expectation that some time the federation would be loosed by mutual action, and each independent unit of it would set up for itself. The idea of propagandism was but faintly, if at all, present in the mind of the Church. The State idea still controlled.[1] The functions of the national body were conceived to be discharged when it had provided and set forth the terms and conditions upon which any new State might come in. When any should be ready it would volunteer to come. Each was thought of as an independent ecclesiastical empire. That had been the underlying principle of the original federation. The idea of the central organism going forth to plant new soil, cultivate the tender shoots, and gather the harvest into the common garner, had hardly begun to be entertained. It was true that the Church's conscience had been dumbly uneasy in presence of the situation for a long time, but

The National Church inactive.

1 White: Memoirs, pp. 464-467.

no way to correct it was evident. For more than a generation there had been Church families "over the mountains," ministered to fitfully by itinerant priests, and often crying out for succor. But with the theory which the Church had accepted about her own relation to the States, she was impotent.[1] She must wait until the feeble folk in any political division should grow strong enough, draw together of their own motion, organize themselves into a State Church, choose a bishop, and ask for admission. Meanwhile they must be left to themselves, not unpitied, but unaided. The Rev. Joseph Doddridge, who itinerated in Western Pennsylvania and Virginia in 1811, says[2] that large portions of that great region, including Kentucky and Eastern Ohio, had been settled originally by Church people from Maryland, Carolina, and Virginia. When they crossed the mountains they left their Church behind them. In their old homes they had enjoyed its privileges, as they had those of sun and soil, without much thought or appreciation. But now that it was lacking, they missed it sadly. They could not fall in with the crude religionism which prevailed in the backwoods. Their children were either becoming indifferent, or being carried away by the rude excitements of Methodism. The indefatigable "circuit-rider," with Wesley's tracts stuffing his saddle-bags, was riding from week's end to week's end under the shadow of the ancient forests, stopping at every clearing to leave a tract and a word of exhortation; frequenting the "log-

Pioneer Churchmen.

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 240.
[2] Ib., p. 238.

rollings," "house-raisings," "huskings," and "scutching-frolics," seeking a chance to preach; unmindful of heat or cold, swollen rivers or gloomy swamps, of ribald jests or coarse opposition, sustained by the fire of a glowing enthusiasm to "save souls from Hell-fire." [1] The Presbyterians were building their log-churches and cabin schoolhouses, organizing Presbyteries, and fixing the religious life of the region for three generations to come.[2] The Churchman was left to one side, unheeded. The Methodist pronounced him destitute of "vital piety;" the Presbyterian called him a superstitious moralist; his own National Church left him to live or die as might be. The half-dozen clergy wandering through this widespread region of poverty and religious confusion met together and begged the Church to come and look after her children. But they begged in vain. Doddridge declares that he had no expectation of even being buried as a Churchman when he should die. He affirms, in a letter to Bishop Hobart in 1816, that if the Church had used her opportunity, there might then have been "four or five bishops in this country, surrounded by a numerous and respectable body of clergy, instead of having our very name connected with a fallen Church." [3]

Methodists and Presbyterians in the backwoods.

These facts had been before the Church, and had disturbed its conscience and heart as early as 1792. Then

[1] Eggleston: The Circuit Rider.
[1] The Hoosier Schoolmaster.
[2] Smith: Old Redstone.
[2] Ib.: History of Western Pennsylvania.
[3] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 26.

the Convention had passed a resolution urging each parish to take an annual collection for the help of the Church people in the western country, and had appointed the Bishop and Standing Committee of Pennsylvania a committee to administer the fund, and to send missionaries when and where they might see fit.[1] So little came of it, and so little was expected to come of it, that Bishop White, in his *résumé* of the Convention's acts, does not so much as allude to it.[2] Sixteen years later a committee of three bishops, three clergy, and three laymen was appointed to consider the situation, and granted the power to send a bishop into the new States and Territories, if they should think it advisable.[3] In 1811 the committee report that they had not been able to see their way to take any action. Bishop White suggests, in that connection, that if a bishop should be appointed in that region, he would hope to be relieved by him of the care of his own parishes which lay beyond the Alleghanies!

First thought of missions.

It would not be fair to say that this long neglect of the regions beyond the pale was wholly the result of indifference, or to say that nothing was done. Something was effected, but at an infinite cost of time and opportunity. Even before the National Church became alive to its corporate responsibility, and before the notion of State autonomy was laid aside, three new States had been carved out of the national domain, and the churches within them had organized themselves

[1] Gen. Con. Journal, 1792.
[2] White: Memoirs, Convention of 1792.
[3] Gen. Con. Journal, 1808.

and come into the federation. These were Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee. The missionary history of these is to be found by following the lives of two remarkable men.

Two streams of emigration flowed westward. The first, from the meagre soil of New England, followed its own belt of latitude and settled in the basin of Lake Erie, and upon the interlacing tributaries of the Cuyahoga, the Muskingum, and the Maumee. New York reabsorbed her own emigrants within the Mohawk valley and her own broad lacustrine domain. The second and fuller tide flowed from the old Middle colonies into the Ohio valley proper, and southwestward toward the Gulf. The first of these carried Philander Chase; the second, James Harvey Otey.

Two streams of emigration.

Chase was of pure New England, Puritan stock, born on the bank of the upper Connecticut, reared hardly in a Vermont farmhouse, and graduated at Dartmouth College.[1] When in college in 1794, he, like Dr. Cutler had done at Yale, seventy years earlier, found, by chance, a Prayer-Book.[2] His study of it brought him to the Church. The young convert went home, upon his graduation, and convinced his father's house. He was ordained, and became at once the indomitable, eager, restless missionary and frontiersman which he remained until his life's end. Probably no man in the American Church has laid so many foundations. He tried his 'prentice hand in the new

Bishop Chase.

[1] Bishop Chase: Reminiscences, second edition, vol. i. p. 7.
[2] Ib., vol. i. p. 16.

settlement on Lake George, and organized a parish there.[1] Among the stumps and cabins at Utica he laid down another; another in the presence of the wondering Indians at Canandaigua; another at Paris; another at Auburn. But his restless spirit soon bore him farther afield. He returned down the Hudson, and sailed away to the far-off mouth of the Mississippi. The "Protestant Church" of New Orleans had already a loose organization. Chase drew its bands closer, persuaded it to come within the Protestant Episcopal Church, and became its rector.[2] His tireless labor, and his excursions far and wide through the swamps and bayous to the outlying settlements, brought him to death's door with a fever, from which he was recovered by a plentiful exhibition of "fixed air."[3] When he brought his shattered body North, he was content to be a parish priest at Hartford only until, with returning strength, returned his "Western fever." In 1817 he started for the distant "Western Reserve." In midwinter, on horseback, and in a shackly pung, he crossed Connecticut and New York, bidding God-speed to the churches he had gathered years before, stopped to rest at the half-dozen cabins of Buffalo, intrusted himself and his horse upon the ice of Lake Erie, was near being drowned more than once by the ice breaking through, and found his journey's end at Salem, Ohio.[4] "There was not an Episcopalian in the place." Nothing daunted, when Sunday

In New Orleans.

Pioneer missionary in Ohio.

[1] Bishop Chase: Reminiscences, vol. ii. p. 28.
[2] Ib., vol i. p. 54.
[3] Ib., vol. i. p. 98.
[4] Ib., vol. i. p. 127.

came, he announced who he was and why he had come, gathered the people together, read prayers, telling the people how and when to respond, and delivered his message. The people "were much pleased with the prayers." There were already two clergy in the State, remote from him and from each other. For a year he went about from hamlet to hamlet, from clearing to clearing, gathered the Church people of whom he heard from time to time, established new posts, put himself in communication with the other missionaries, and in 1818, five clergy, constituting the whole force in the State, together with half a dozen laymen, met, organized a diocese, and elected Chase bishop. He was consecrated in Philadelphia, February 11, 1819. Then he plodded back on horseback, nearly freezing by the way, through York, McConnellsburg, Greensburg, and Pittsburg to Ohio, and began his life's work as bishop and backwoodsman. The frontiersmen were either indifferent or hostile to the Church. Indeed, Episcopalians formed a small proportion of the emigrants to the West. In the previous history of the country, the Church, as has been seen, had its strength mainly among the wealthy, official, aristocratic classes. These did not go West. It was the farmers, yeomanry, and mechanics who sought better fortune beyond the mountains. These were, for the most part, ignorant of the Church's ways and spirit. Few men have ever known so well as Bishop Chase how to win them. Once when he had appointed a service at a certain time at a distant place, he found, upon his arrival, that the hostile denominations had intentionally fixed a "Union Pro-

The frontier bishop.

tracted Meeting," at the same time and place. When he came in it was in full blast. Fortunately he found on the outskirts of the crowd a Presbyterian gentleman, who did not at all approve of the tactics which his minister had used in fixing this meeting. By him the Bishop sent, courteously asking the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist ministers present to come to him. When they came, sullen and pugnacious, he said, "I have come here by appointment to hold a service; I beg you will join with me in conducting it and making it profitable." Without waiting for a reply, he marched to the platform, with them at his heels, and announced: "Neighbors, I hold in one hand a Bible, in the other a Prayer-Book. The one teaches us how to live, the other how to pray. I know you are familiar with the one, I doubt if you are with the other. I have brought some dozens of copies with me. With the aid of these, my good brethren, I will try to lead you in the service. If any of you, through the depravity of the natural heart, are averse to being 'taught how to pray,' you need the teaching all the more on that very account. Without *confession* there is, as you know, no remission of sins. We will therefore confess our sins to Almighty God, all in the same voice. You will observe that no man can say 'Our Father' until he has confessed his faults; we will now say 'Our Father who art in heaven.' The proper attitude when we pray is upon our knees, as did Solomon, Daniel, Stephen, and Paul. After their example, I enjoin upon you all to fall upon your knees." And so the service proceeded, "the response from the great congregation being as the voice of many waters."

Did any good result from it? He "hopes so indeed; but much of the good was lost for want of shepherds to gather in the lambs." [1] As a man who knew his people, lived and loved their life, he travelled hither and thither, and laid the foundation of the Church in Ohio. The monument to his name is Kenyon College.

Kenyon College.

He saw very early that the Church, to be successful among the people, must be home-bred. There was no place or way to train up a ministry; he would make one. When his plan was mature, he took the unheard-of step of going to England for the money needed. No such bishop had been seen there for a thousand years. His rugged simplicity awoke attention, and he became the rage. With the friendship of great men and noble ladies, with his pockets full of money, he came home and planted his seminary and college.[2] He built his brain and heart in it. But with its growth and success came a conflict between himself and his subordinates as to its management. Finally, after what seemed to him an unworthy and ungrateful thwarting of his wishes in the matter, he turned his back upon the noble institution which stood in the broad demesne that he had wrested from the wilderness, mounted his horse, and rode away into the backwoods of Michigan. His real work was among the primitive frontiersmen. But in Kenyon College and Jubilee College he laid foundations upon which other men ought long ago to have built strong towers for education and the Church. They were earliest on the ground.

[1] Reminiscences, vol. ii. p. 201.
[2] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 170.

They possessed the good-will and respect of the people among whom they were planted. But they have been overshadowed long since by the institutions of other faiths. Bishop Chase had done his work. Through him the Church in Ohio had been gathered, and received, not without questioning and hesitation, into the Federation which waited yet for such State Churches as might volunteer to come.

Kentucky had already come. Among its very earliest settlers had been a clergyman of the Church. The first to enter its borders had been Episcopalians from Virginia. But they were early overrun by the stream of Scotch-Irish which poured over the Blue Ridge after the Revolution. These carried with them the antipathy to the Church which their fathers had brought across the ocean with them. It had not been lessened by the Revolution and the Indian wars. The "Episcopal Church" was linked in their minds with Tories, and with the British officers whom some of them had seen among the Indians when, in their own early life, they had been carried as prisoners to Detroit. They had learned their letters from a primer on the title-page of which was a cut of John Rogers at the stake, surrounded by his wife and children. The picture, with its moral, was as deeply fixed in their prejudices as was the alphabet in their memories.[1] The memory of the early missionary, murdered by the Indians, had faded out of the land.[2] But in 1794, a prominent Presbyterian minister, the first president of

Church in Kentucky.

[1] Roosevelt: Winning of the West, vol. i. p. 309.
[2] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 198.

Transylvania University, had come into the Church, been ordained, and ministered to the scattered people. A few years later a popular Methodist preacher had followed his example. But in the main the country was given over to the revivalism which came in during the last years of the "Great Awakening."[1] From time to time, at long intervals, adventurous clergy found their way among the uncouth backwoodsmen. In the larger towns a permanent lodgement was slowly effected. In 1829 the clergy of the region and lay representatives from Lexington, Louisville, and Danville met and organized the Church in Kentucky. Three parishes, with four ministers, composed its strength. They elected Benjamin Bosworth Smith to be their bishop, and another State was admitted to the federation.

Bishop Otey.

James Harvey Otey was a gaunt, raw-boned, six-foot-three son of a Virginia farmer, the grandson of a Revolutionary soldier, born under the shadow of the Peaks of Otter. When he had graduated at the "University of North Carolina" he intrusted his life and fortune to the stream which was bearing the enterprise and vigor of his day to the West and South. The wares at his disposal were such as he had accumulated while at college. He moved to Franklin, Tenn., and became the pioneer school-teacher.[2] When thus employed he came in contact with one of the few passing priests, and was baptized. He went to North Carolina, and was ordained by Bishop Ravenscroft, the man

[1] Tracy: The Great Awakening.
[1] Roosevelt: vol. i. p. 309.
[2] Green: Life of Bishop Otey, p. 7.

he loved above all others. When he returned to his school there was no Episcopal congregation in the State, and no other clergyman of his Church within two hundred miles of him.[1] His office was despised by the people among whom he lived, and his Church was held in contempt.[2] Curiosity drew the people to "hear the Episcopal minister pray, and his wife jaw back at him" in the responses.[3] When they had come, however, Otey's splendid character and deep earnestness retained them. He was a man of the backwoodsmen's own sort. Once when he was asleep in a rude tavern, a local gambler waked him roughly and demanded his bed as his own. When the sleepy man demurred the gambler threatened to throw him out of the window. Then the sturdy priest thrust from under the cover a brawny arm, worthy of the Holy Clerk of Copmanhurst, and said: "Before you try to throw me out of the window, please feel that."[4] His stalwart Christian manliness and sweet devotion made him and his Church respected. He was tireless and successful in laboring for its growth. In 1829, he, with two other clergymen, met in Nashville, and organized the Protestant Episcopal Church of Tennessee. When their number grew to five, they chose Otey bishop, and a new State was admitted to the federal Church. The churches in Mississippi put themselves under Bishop Otey's care. Like Chase in Ohio, he dreamed of a theological

Church in Tennessee.

[1] Green: Life of Bishop Otey, p. 42.

[2] Ib., p. 56: "I knew and felt at the time that I was looked upon with contempt, if not despised, by the great mass of the people."

[3] Ib., p. 56.

[4] Ib., p. 84.

school. He was a teacher by instinct and habit. He labored for years to establish Christian education. He left his impress upon the public schools of his own State and Mississippi. He founded a school for girls, and another for boys. But his own dream did not come true for many a year, when it was realized in the University of the South. In the first five years of his Episcopate the clergy of his diocese increased from five to twenty-one.[1] But a whole generation had meanwhile been lost to the Church.

To overtake the movement of population in the great West had already become well-nigh impossible. Unless the National Church should abandon its preconception of autonomous State Churches it never would be possible. As to the government of the churches already within the federation, the notion of State independence was already slowly disappearing. A movement toward centralization had long since set in unobserved. Powers were even now exercised by the General Convention without question, which had at first been assumed without question to belong to the States. The time had now come for the National Church to become a Propaganda. In 1835 it abandoned its impotent attitude of waiting for churches to come, and resolved to move out and build them. The General Convention, in that year, formally declared that every baptized member was *ipso facto* a missionary; constituted a Board of Managers who should represent the whole people; and provided for the *sending* missionary bishops in advance of any *call* for them.

The new departure in 1835.

[1] Green: Life of Bishop Otey, p. 42.

The action was revolutionary. Through it, Episcopacy passed from the idea of a Federation of constituent State Churches to that of a National Church with component dioceses. It was not by accident that the question of the division of one of the original States into two or more dioceses arose at the same convention. Both actions sprang from the same source. The conception of the Church's structure had changed.[1] While the old theory obtained, its enthusiasm could not find expression. So long as it remained in the calm, cautious, constructive mood, that theory would suffice; but if ever its heart should be deeply stirred, it would change its way of thinking. That access of zeal had already come, and the old bottles could not contain the new wine.

[1] White: Memoirs, p. 465.

CHAPTER VIII.

NEW SPIRITUAL FORCES.

THE preaching of the Evangelical leaders "awaked the Church of England from its philosophical pride and lethargy." [1] The sleep had been so profound that it had looked like death. The repulsive picture of English church and social life in the last century need not again be drawn. In America things had never been so bad. The decencies of life had always been maintained here. But in the first years of the century the religious tone had been very low indeed. The Church had largely caught the spirit of the age. Those who reorganized it were men whose religious habits had been fixed under the old conditions. A very few were men of marked devotion, but, as a rule, they were content with a very low spiritual life, and entirely indifferent to doctrine.[2] The clergy hardly took their office seriously, and the laity feared "enthusiasm" so much that they were content with less than earnestness. Virginia rejected the "Proposed Book" because its rubric gave the minister the power to repel an evil liver from the Holy Communion. Maryland chose Dr. Smith its bishop, well knowing his questionable habits; and the

Meagre spiritual life.

[1] Merivale: Four Lectures, London, 1879.
[1] Ryle: Christian Leaders in the Eighteenth Century.
[2] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 188.

General Convention, with the same knowledge, elected him its president. Bishop Provoost lived for years in neglect of the offices of the Church, and Bishop Madison was currently believed to be an infidel. The ecclesiastical precision of Bishop Seabury and the Connecticut clergy made them earnest to preserve the Church's purity in doctrine and discipline rather than the vigor of its life. A spiritual motive force was needed to carry the new Church into and through its Titanic task of ministering to the needs of a new nation. Such a force had begun to show itself in England in the darkest days of the last century, and was destined in the first quarter of the present one to dominate the American Church.

The "Holy Club," which Wesley joined at Oxford, was only one of many similar groups of earnest-minded men who prayed for light in the midst of abounding gloom. The group to which Wesley belonged pursued its own course. He and his following started upon a path which led them outside the Church of England. But the great majority, his peers in zeal and wisdom, remained within. Wesley's path and theirs ran parallel a little way, but soon diverged. Methodists and Evangelicals had quite as many points of difference as of likeness.[1] They were different stocks from the same root. The Evangelical fathers could not march with Wesley. He turned from them with impatience when they refused to break away from the old order.[2] His methods were equally distasteful

The Evangelicals.

[1] Abbey and Overton: Church of England in the Eighteenth Century, vol. ii. p. 168.

[2] Ib., vol. ii. p. 190.

to them. The hypercritical Hervey and the learned, decorous Romaine were men of an altogether different type from Ingham, the Yorkshire evangelist, and Asbury, the itinerant revivalist.[1] It was Venn, the faithful parish priest and writer of the robust "Complete Duty of Man," Scott, the staid rector of Olney, Milner, the Church historian, Simeon, the missionary, and such as these who were the fathers of the Evangelicals. Their influence was dominant in the English Church when this century opened. They lifted its sodden body from the mire of the Georgian era, set its feet upon a rock, and established its goings. They had their peculiar cant, as all religious parties have, but they secured an attention which other language would hardly have compelled. A mode of presenting Christianity which could compel the assent of human beings so far unlike as Dr. Johnson and Hannah More must needs be potent. The two salient features of the school were its conceptions of the personal Christian life, and of the function of the Church. As to the first of these, it laid emphasis upon *Conversion*. Like Roger Williams and Jonathan Edwards, like the Moravians and Wesley, it conceived the starting-point to be a conscious experience. Their system had for its background the Augustinian dogma of total depravity. John Newton, the converted slave-trader, was its type. The good priest Thomas Scott, already of saintly life, must needs be "converted" after years of a useful ministry.[2]

Their differentiate.

[1] Tyerman: Oxford Methodists, p. 332.

[2] Seely: Later Evangelical Fathers, p. 160.

[2] Petitions were publicly offered in the "Prayer Meetings" of certain Philadelphia parishes for the "conversion" of Bishop White when he was already a patriarch!

When Simeon gained a scholarship at King's College, Cambridge, and confronted the legal duty of receiving the Lord's Supper, he shrinks away in terror. He buys the old "Whole Duty of Man," and makes himself ill with reading, fasting, and praying. He "sought to lay his sins on the sacred head of Jesus, and on the Wednesday began to have a hope of mercy; on Thursday that hope increased; on the Friday and Saturday it became more strong; on the Sunday morning peace flowed in rich abundance into my soul."[1] This is typical. Milner expands the individual experience and traces it in his history of the Church. Heretofore, he contends, men have written the story of the Church as they would the annals of an empire. He will distinguish between the real and nominal Christians, leave the latter to one side, and trace the Church through the former.[2]

Conscious experience.

But the exploitation of the personal experience did not blind them to the use of the Church. Scott maintained the weekly Communion at a time when it was generally neglected.[3] Simeon "had the sweetest access to God through my blessed Saviour at the Lord's table." But he brings his previous experience into the closest relation with it. When the priest gave him a piece left over of the consecrated bread, after the service, "I put it into my mouth, covered my face with my hand, and prayed. The clergyman, seeing it, smiled at me; but I thought *that if he had felt such a load taken off*

[1] Seely: Later Evangelical Fathers, p. 238.

[2] Abbey and Overton: English Church in Eighteenth Century, vol. ii. p. 210.

[3] Seely: Later Evangelical Fathers, p. 168.

his soul as I had, he would not deem my praises superfluous."

The place assigned by them to personal experience, of course, gave the Evangelicals a peculiar relation to Christians outside their own or any church. Whoever was ready to testify to his own conscious connection with Christ must needs be accepted as a brother. No one might go behind the man's own testimony, — unless, indeed, his life should grossly discredit it. This led them to relations with other churches, which induced those who claim for the Church an original jurisdiction in the religious life to distrust their purpose. Simeon, when he goes to Scotland, has Presbyterians for his friends, and joins with them in the Sacrament without hesitation.[1] But he at once turns to his brethren in the Church and explains. He holds that an English clergyman *may* preach in the Established Church of Scotland, in which his king *must* worship, if there. Besides that, he declares with earnestness, that after every such experience he "returns to the use of the Liturgy perfectly astonished at the vast superiority of our own mode of worship."[2] The men of this school, both in England and America, were always emphatic in protesting their loyalty to the Church. They must be allowed to have known their own minds, and to have spoken sincerely. But they did not always get themselves believed. They gave their allegiance to the Church from use and wont, from conviction of her better ways and

Their theory of the Church.

Low Churchmen.

[1] Seely: Later Evangelical Fathers, p. 265.
[2] Ib., p. 264.

methods. But it was with them an act of choice. In the background of their minds was always the feeling that they might innocently have chosen otherwise. The people, with that rough accuracy which belongs to popular judgment, called them *low Churchmen*. Their Churchmanship was a matter of their own election, and not of obligation.[1] The *high* Churchman distrusted them, not because of their present conduct, but from fear of the latent mischief which might any day spring from their reservation of the possibility of choice. To his mind, it was not a region where a choice was allowable.

In an age when the spiritual life of the Church was well-nigh extinct, only such men could revive it. They believed with all their souls in the awful doom which awaited every unconverted man. They believed that every man might be aroused and set to work out the tragedy of salvation in his own conscious life. This gave to the words of earnest men, as it needs must, a pathos and entreaty which told. Two generations later the Evangelical School, as such, had practically disappeared. By that time the Church, which it had waked into life, had been taken by the hand by other leaders, and led in another direction. They looked after her sadly, for they loved her. They felt that she had been beguiled away from their safer guardianship. But the truth was that their decadence, when it came, was not due so much to the triumph of a rival ecclesiasticism, as to the fact that a far deeper change had taken place in the mind of the religious world. The Evangelicals had been Calvinists.

Cause of their decline.

[1] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 140.

When the people ceased to believe the Augustinian anthropology, the motive to which they had appealed had gone.[1] Their preaching, which had so deeply stirred a generation which had believed itself to be "totally depraved," failed to move a generation which had come into a truer way of thinking about itself. Salvation had come to be thought of less as a *rescue* from impending doom, and more as an *education* in righteousness. The dread of future torment became less easy to awake. The "larger hope" embodied itself at first in a crude universalism. A *soi-disant* church sprang up with this belief for its foundation and title, and for a while grew strong. But what truth was in it diffused itself through the Christian world, and Universalism declined. A truer estimate of man's complex nature began to obtain. This fundamental change of view coincided in point of time with the fresh presentation of the Church as an authoritative teacher and guide. When this had come about, men turned away from the Evangelicals. In the first quarter of the century, they throve apace; in the second, they encountered a rival too strong for them; in the third, they began to decline.

In 1835, the period at which the Church adjusted her machinery of propagandism, their vigor was at its best. The tracts and leaflets of Bishop Porteus, himself a Virginian, had been eagerly read by Virginians. Thomas Scott, the rector of Aston Sanford, Bucks, to eke out his meagre salary, had written the famous Commentary from which so many millions have received their theology. It had a circulation

Thomas Scott.

[1] The Churchman: vol. v. p. 856.

hardly paralleled in literary history. Before his death, in 1821, the English edition had reached twelve thousand copies, and the American more than twenty-five thousand.[1] The "Great Awakening" and the Methodist movement had prepared the way for Evangelical work. Rev. Joseph Pilmore, once a Wesleyan preacher, had taught it in Philadelphia.[2] Dr. Percy, one time a chaplain of Lady Huntingdon, had proclaimed it in South Carolina. William Duke, a Methodist while the Methodists remained in the Church, had preached it in Maryland. Bishop Griswold commended it by his deep piety in New England, outside of Connecticut. But the great apostle was Bishop Meade of Virginia. It was the motive power of his own earnestly religious life.[3] For years, almost single-handed, he had labored, and successfully, to revive the old Virginia Church. Now he was the Evangelical champion in the National Church. The founding of the Virginia Seminary gave their distinctive doctrines a home. In Dr. Wilmer, its chief teacher, they found a fit and winning expositor.[4] Hopkins, Boyd, Bull, and Bedell in Pennsylvania; Milnor and Channing Moore in New York; McIlvaine in Brooklyn; Tyng, Bristed, and Crocker in New England, all poured their evangelical fervor into the Church's life.[5] The striking success of Chase in Ohio, in spite of the sustained opposition of Bishop Hobart, had given it *éclat*. It was at its best in mind and heart.

Leaders in America.

[1] Abbey and Overton: Church of England in the Eighteenth Century, vol. ii. p. 206.

[2] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 192.

[3] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 255. (Dr. Sparrow's Sermon.)

[4] Memoirs of Dr. Tyng, p. 70.

[5] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 193.

But, meanwhile, a stream of renewed life had set in from another quarter. The hard and narrow Churchmanship of the Tory school had been taken up by Bishop Hobart of New York and his followers. Their broader spirit and deeper devotion made it more humane. Bishop Seabury's task had been to stand out for the organizing principle of the Church. But his eye, from being so long and so persistently fixed upon a single point, had lost the power of looking afield. By the political circumstance in which he and his had been set, they had been isolated from contemporary life. Bishop Hobart was as uncompromising a Churchman as Seabury, but he was a man of his time. He brought the Episcopal Church into harmony with the spirit of modern life. In the report upon the state of the Church for 1820, the State upon which he had left his impress shows more life and work than all the rest together.[1] One hundred and eighteen organized churches, twenty-four deacons, and fourteen priests ordained, fifteen hundred persons confirmed, a flourishing mission among the Oneida Indians, Bible societies, Prayer-Book societies, Sunday-school unions and the foundation for a theological seminary, show the presence of a new force. Being set in charge of Connecticut temporarily, he carried there, also, the same broad sympathy, tireless energy, ready adaptability, — the elements which the Church of Bishop Seabury needed. His conception of the Church colored the stream of emigration which flowed steadily westward following the latitude of his own State.

High-Church revival.

[1] Gen. Con. Journal, 1820.

Away to the south, a man of more fiery zeal, but holding fast to the same idea of Episcopacy,[1] revived the work in North Carolina. Bishop Ravenscroft left his mark on the Church in the South and Southwest.[2] Otey, the pioneer bishop of that great region, who had sat at his feet and loved him as a father, caught his spirit and passed it on to his own successor.

The two parties.

There had now emerged in the Church two broadly distinguished types of thought and life. With the death of Bishop White, in 1836, the last survivor of the old "opportunist" school passed away. The future now for a generation lay between Evangelicals and High Churchmen. The line of cleavage did not run sharply through the mass. The two contrasted principles mingled in varying proportions in individuals. The same man might, and often did, embrace them both. He held to the conscious religious life with the Evangelical, and dreamed of ecclesiastical empire with the High Churchman. Indeed, in all the controversies of the period, each makes a point of asserting that he held to the principles of the other, — modified and corrected by his own. But two spirits strove within the Church. When action was necessary, party lines were drawn. When the High Churchmen took up the Sunday-school Union, the Evangelicals, disturbed at Bishop Hobart's Catechism, and scandalized by the mutilation of Mrs. Sherwood's books, started an Evangelical Knowledge Society as an offset.[3] When this grew influ-

[1] Norton: Life of Bishop Ravenscroft, p. 95.
[2] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 192.
[2] The Churchman, March 17, 1832.
[3] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 225.

ential, the other side set up the Churchman's Library.[1] They worked and planned together to organize the new machinery of missions: but when the Evangelicals began to suspect that they had been outmanœuvred, they set up a rival volunteer society.[2] Their enthusiasm had already found a vent in foreign missions. Through their beloved Simeon and Henry Martyn, the religious world had been stirred with pity for heathenesse. This was the field into which the Evangelical could move far more readily than could the pronounced High Churchman. The purpose which he set before himself, to awaken individual souls and lead them one by one to establish relations with God, required little machinery. All that was needed was to find a godly man who should go and "tell them the story of the Cross." In 1822 a mission to Africa was determined upon, but no ship could be found to carry out Ephraim Bacon and his wife. In 1834 the Rev. Henry Lockwood sailed to China, where this Church has now twenty-two native clergy. With the single exception of the abortive attempt in Turkey, all the foreign mission enterprises were manned from the Virginia Seminary.[3] A tacit understanding had been reached that this should be the field of the Evangelicals, while the High Churchmen should exploit the home field.[4] There does not seem to have been any conscious strategy in this arrangement, but it acted directly in the interest of High Churchmanship, which

Division of labor.

[1] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 230.
[2] Ib., p. 200.
[3] Ib., p. 197.
[4] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 194.

for a long time steadily gained ground. While its opponents' energy was directed elsewhere, it moved northwest and southwest, crossed the Mississippi, and has since been dominant. The Low Churchmen's expectation that they should secure at least one of the two new missionary bishoprics was disappointed.[1]

Rising Churchmanship.

The Church's forces moved out, under the new leaders, to win the mighty West. To trace in detail the steps by which they covered the prairies, climbed the Rocky Mountains, and went with the gold-hunters to the Pacific, would require a volume. The roll of the missionaries' names would fill a book. The Church simply followed the emigrant, often lagging far behind him, but keeping him in sight while her strength would hold out. When he had built his cabin, she sought him out in it. When the great cities sprang up in the wilderness, she entered into them and built her house. When the savage Indian was restrained, and fixed to a permanent abode, she did her share to make him human and Christian. She met a various welcome for her proffered gifts. Peoples who knew neither her nor her fathers founded new communities, and she could not speak their speech or win their friendship. Other churches entered the new field beside her, before her, and behind her. She often failed where they succeeded. She often succeeded after their success had changed to failure. It may fairly be said of her that she has striven with an honest heart

Following the emigration.

[1] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 200.
[1] Meade: Old Churches, p. 379.

to do her share in making and keeping the new America Christian. In the long, strenuous task, she has more and more sharply emphasized her churchly aspect.

Two ideals.

When Chase reached the new land of Ohio, in 1817, it seemed natural for him to begin his work at "Covenant Creek" by calling together his neighbors for the preaching of the Word, and the Prayers. When Breck and his companions laid down their packs under an elm-tree in Minnesota, in 1850, it seemed equally natural and fitting to them to "erect a rustic cross, build a rude altar of rough stones, and begin their work by the celebration of the Eucharistic Feast."

CHAPTER IX.

THE CATHOLIC RENAISSANCE.

Between 1835 and the War of the Rebellion, the Church adjusted its manner of life to its changed conception of its constitution. When it had determined to send missionary bishops to the unappropriated West, it abandoned the attitude of a federation waiting for new units to propose themselves for membership. For the future it intended to act as a National Church. When it divided one of the old integers, and made a second diocese in New York, the old conception of State churches became no longer possible.

"The change was fundamental. The analogy between 'States' and 'dioceses' was thereby broken down. Not only did the idea of diocesan sovereignty thus receive a serious shock, but in proportion to the weakening of the dioceses by subdivision was the power of the General Church increased." [1] The change was made, so far as can be seen, without a dissenting voice. It only recorded a change which had already occurred in people's way of thinking. The Church was becoming less an abstraction and more an entity. From many directions influences were converging to bring out this idea into distinct consciousness. The nation was be-

[1] Dr. Francis Wharton, in Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 401.

coming consolidated, and the Church centralized. One of the capital powers originally reserved to the States was assumed by the General Church, without challenge, when it provided for the trial and deposition of a diocesan bishop.[1] Possibly the grotesque result of a diocesan trial, just had, may have influenced this change. The Bishop of Kentucky had been presented under an accusation of falsehood. There were three charges against him, of one hundred and ninety-eight specifications.[2] The astounding verdict of the court chosen by the diocese had been: "Guilty; but without the least criminality!"[3] Under the changed law the Bishop of Pennsylvania was tried and suspended for drunkenness. His brother, the Bishop of New York, was tried and suspended for lasciviousness. The Bishop of New Jersey was three times presented, and twice brought before a court, but without trial, upon charges affecting his integrity. All these trials, which at the time occupied the general attention, served to fix the popular mind upon the General Church, which was the party prosecuting. It came to be looked to as the sole source of authority in matters of discipline. It was but a step to thinking likewise of its authority in doctrine and life. The religion of Church people was unconsciously taking a deeper ecclesiastical tinge. The Church was becoming more sharply differentiated, not only from the world, but from the current forms of American Christianity.

Trial of bishops.

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 278.

[2] The Churchman, vol. vii. No. 38.

[3] "Sentence of the Court in the case of the Diocese of Kentucky *vs.* the Right Rev. B. B. Smith."

Prayer-Book societies were actively sustained in Pennsylvania and New York. Their purpose was not solely to teach men how to pray. A second purpose, which soon stepped up beside the primary one, was to propagate the Church. Tract societies which had this for their avowed object began to be popular.[1] "Nova Anglicana" wrote long articles against the Puritans. Dr. Muhlenberg's broad, catholic spirit began to make itself felt upon his pupils. The elder Bishop Doane and Dr. Croswell struck the same note in their hymns and sonnets that Keble did in his "Christian Year."[2] Professor Doane of Trinity College was the first to welcome Keble in America. He had anticipated his motive. Dr. Coxe soon carried the theme to its highest note and sweetest harmony, in his "Christian Ballads." Professor Whittingham at the General Seminary marshalled the facts of Church history to the same end. Bishop Hopkins, the keenest of controversialists, wrote the "Primitive Creed" and the "Primitive Church." Dr. Francis L. Hawks gathered up the Church record of colonial times. Bishop Onderdonk carried on a pamphlet war with Presbyterians about the divine right of Episcopacy.[3] Books of sacramental devotion began to come in. Bishop Griswold's and Bishop Meade's Family Prayers continued to sell, but Bishop Hobart's "Companion for the Altar" outsold them both.[4] The great Temperance enthusiasm which was agitating the world, preaching

The Church idea.

[1] The Churchman: vol. v. p. 835.
[2] Rev. Julius H. Ward, in Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 615.
[3] The Churchman, vol. v. p. 816.
[4] Ib., vol. v., advertisements, *passim*.

total abstinence as a duty and denouncing the use of fermented wine at the Holy Communion, called public attention to the Church's different way of dealing with this and kindred subjects.[1] A new collection of Hymns, chiefly the selection[2] of Dr. Muhlenberg and Bishop Onderdonk, had now been long enough in use to infuse a more distinctive churchly sentiment among the people. Church schools were springing up on every hand. Dr. Muhlenberg was fixing the type of them at Flushing Institute. Bristol College advertised that it was so full that no more students could be accommodated.[3]

Increasing activity.

Parish machinery for Church work was set up everywhere, — female sewing societies, missionary societies, aid societies, benevolent societies, — until an English Church paper ridicules the movement by declaring that a church in Boston had started a "Ladies' Anti-young-man-standing-at-the-church-door Society."[4] The Bishop of New York issued a plea for free churches in the interest of church extension, and his plea was opposed from Philadelphia on the ground that not propagation but edification was the pressing need.[5] The attention of the whole Church was kept fixed by the General Missionary Society upon the needs of the West. It cries out with shame that while the town of St. Louis is ready and anxious to have a minister, there is not one in the whole State of Missouri;[6] that there is

[1] The Churchman, vol. ii. p. 906.
[2] Ayres: Life of Dr. Muhlenberg, p. 84.
[3] The Churchman, vol. v. p. 835.
[4] Ib., vol. v. p. 858.
[5] Ib., vol. vi. pp. 1070, 1174.
[6] Ib., vol. v. p. 898.

but one in the State of Mississippi. It announces with enthusiasm that a strong parish has been organized in Mobile and another hopeful one in Memphis; and that the Rev. Mr. Salmon has just started from Western New York, with a little company of fifteen families, to found a Church colony in Texas.[1]

Change of manners.

Four-legged Communion tables were going out, and solid oaken ones were coming in. In a few churches stone altars began to appear. The black academic gown began to give place to the white priestly robe as the dress of the officiating minister. The surplice, which had been split down the front a century before, so that it might be put on without deranging the befloured wigs, was now sewed up again, and on its breast began to show some churchly emblem. Memorials began to come up to have its use made obligatory.[2] Bishop Hobart criticises the Virginians for their neglect of ornaments, and Bishop Meade defends them. He urges that *de minimis non curat lex;* that Bishop Hobart himself sometimes dispensed not only with his robes but with his gown as well; that he had the high example of the Archbishop of Canterbury for ordaining deacons in their every-day dress; and that Bishop Moore had never worn any uniform, save when performing distinctively episcopal acts.[3] Both the criticism and the defence show the drift.

The emergence of the idea of corporate religion as distinguished from individual salvation directed attention

[1] The Churchman: vol. vi. p. 1046.
[2] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 240.
[3] Ib., pp. 240, 241.

both to the ministry and to the machinery of the Church. Nor was this drift toward corporate action in religion confined to the Episcopal Church. It was moving in the Christian world. The Methodists were gathering their scattered forces into an ecclesiastical empire,[1] and lamenting the decadence of the personal enthusiasm which had marked the men of the previous generation. In 1832 a General Synod had taken up into itself the particular synods of the Reformed Church.[2] Ten years earlier the Reformed Presbyterians had organized their Presbyteries into a General Synod.[3] The question of constitutional right, which in 1837 split it asunder, was agitating the Presbyterian General Assembly.[4] The last step in the centralization of the Roman Church was coming within the range of practical politics, in the dogma of Papal Infallibility. The old churches of Sir Christopher Wren were being replaced by a higher ecclesiastical architecture. The current of religious feeling was setting steadily away from the sharp *individualism* of Edwards and Whitefield and Wesley and the Great Awakening, and the Evangelicals, toward the thought of *solidarity* among those who are being saved.

Corporate religion.

The set was already evident, when the "Oxford Movement" came. It changed the current into a flood. Its effect upon Church life has been so enormous that it should be traced from its origin.

The "Oxford Movement."

1 Stevens: History of Methodism, pp. 520, 582.
2 Manual of the Reformed Church in America, third edition, p. 73.
3 Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, p. 1908.
4 Schaff-Herzog, p. 1908.

In 1825 the Church of England was dominated by a devout but meagre Calvinism. Its political life was tossed and threatened by the wave of liberalism which had broken over France a generation earlier. Many sagacious men feared that forces were moving in society which were hostile to religion itself. They believed that the current mode of presenting Christianity could not prevail against them. They believed the Church to be in special danger. They had no confidence in its recognized champions. All sorts of Church "Reforms" were afloat. One proposed the abolition of church rates. Another offered to expel the bishops from Parliament. Another proposed entire separation of Church and State. Another offered to unite all sects with the Church by act of Parliament, and give them the use of church buildings conjointly.[1] A Roman Catholic Relief Bill and a Reform Bill were pending. In 1833 ten Irish bishoprics were suppressed. The same year a little group of men met in the Common Room of Oriel College, Oxford, to form an "Association for vindicating the Rights of the Church and restoring the Knowledge of Sound Principles."[2]

The company were bound together only by the bond of a common purpose. That was declared in the title of the association. To reach their end each man was free to walk in his own road. Some gave their adhesion to the association after it was founded; some never formally joined it at all. Their names have become known the world over: — Froude,

The "Tractarians."

[1] Stephens: Life of Dean Hook, p. 106, *et seq.*
[2] Ib., p. 107.

Keble, Palmer, Rose, Pusey, and, greatest of all, Newman. Their object was to restore the Church's true doctrine. They held that, at present at least, emphasis was laid upon doubtful or untenable dogmas, while the abiding truths, the truths which belonged to the Church pre-eminently, had been allowed to fall into obscurity. These last were the ones, they maintained, about which must be fought the battle against infidelity. They set about to re-state them, in a series of "Tracts for the Times." What the doctrines were may be seen from the titles of the Tracts. They were such as these: Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission; The Catholic Church; Archbishop Ussher on Prayers for the Dead; On Baptismal Regeneration; On Apostolical Succession; On the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist; On Purgatory; On Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge; On Fasting; On Holy Baptism.[1]

The Tracts were for the most part from Newman's pen.[2] When they first began to appear, they were hailed with welcome by the men who, throughout the kingdom, were dissatisfied with the existent life. But they presently became disturbing. The fear arose that if the English Church should be rehabilitated by these men, her children would not be able to recognize her in her new dress. This apprehension became a certainty when Newman put out Tract No. XC. In it he sustained the thesis that the teachings of the Thirty-nine Articles, "though the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be sub-

1 Tracts for the Times: 6 vols., Rivingtons, 1834.
2 Stephens: Life of Dean Hook, p. 111.

scribed to by those who aim at being catholic in heart and doctrine." [1] What he meant by "catholic" became evident from the text. It meant something which plain men could not distinguish from Romish. This had been steadfastly denied by the Tractarians. They had maintained that there was a *Via Media*, a middle path, between Rome and Protestantism, — that this middle term was Catholicity. But to the Tractarians this middle ground could not be satisfactory. They sought a position for the Church from which it could beat back the forces of liberalism. They found that Liberalism and Protestantism were the same in essence. The heart of each was *private judgment* as against *authority*. Newman came to see this before his fellows did. His quarrel was not with the current doctrine or practice of the Church, but with what he conceived to be a fatal tendency in society itself. "My battle was with *Liberalism*. By Liberalism I mean the anti-dogmatic spirit and its development. It is scarcely now a party; it is the educated lay world. It is nothing else than that deep, plausible skepticism which is the development of human reason as practically exercised by the natural man." [2]

The *Via Media*.

Newman's purpose.

His was a profound distrust of the spirit of the age. Against the incoming of this spirit he could see no barrier which he thought to be sufficient. He appealed therefore from the world to the Church, and from the Church of the present to the Church of the past.

[1] Introduction to Tract No. XC.

[2] Apologia: New York, Catholic Publishing House, p. 285.

Under his leadership a company of choice spirits set out upon a voyage of discovery through the centuries in search of a church which would be true enough to teach men, and strong enough to govern them. A deep interest had lately been awakened in the middle ages by the romances of Sir Walter Scott.[1] The wizard had cast a glamour over the pre-Reformation Church. With a profound disbelief in present inspiration, the Tractarians adventured hopefully to find a pure and perfect church at some point in the past.

Tractarians not reformers.

It is a common belief that a wish to reform glaring abuses then existent in the Church was a co-operative motive. There is little evidence of the existence of such abuses, and none of any attempt to reform them. It was not a beautiful age, but the Church in England and America seems to have been discharging her practical duties relatively as well as in any age.[2] The leaders of the "Oxford Movement" did not burden themselves with reform of evil manners. They had a different aim. Men could only be safe in thought and conduct when led by a visible Divine Authority. No trustworthy authority was extant; they would find one in a restored and reconstructed Church. They gathered the materials for such a church painfully from various places and dates, and put them together in an ideal which they called a

1 Fisher: History of Christian Church, p. 630.
2 Mozley: Reminiscences, ch. li.
2 Newman's account of his own religious life, Apologia: p. 56, "... Thomas Scott, to whom, humanly speaking, I owe my soul."
2 Froude: Short Studies, Scribners, 1883, p 156.
2 Dean Hook: Life, pp. 99, 103.
2 Beardsley: History of the Church in Connecticut, vol. ii. p. 244.

Via Media between liberalism and papalism, between Protestantism and Romanism as they then were. This ideal was abandoned with scorn by its constructors, who went away by opposite roads, Newman and his friends to Rome, Froude and his friends to infidelity, Hook and his friends to the work they had been doing before the movement began.

Before his departure Newman made a present of his *Via Media:* "Whether the ideas of the coming age upon religion be true or false, they will be real. In the present day mistiness is the mother of wisdom. A man who can set down half a dozen general propositions, which escape from destroying one another only by being diluted into truisms; who can hold the balance between opposite sides so skilfully as to do without fulcrum or beam; who never enunciates a truth without guarding himself against being supposed to exclude its contradictory; who holds that Scripture is the only authority, yet that the Church is to be deferred to; that faith only justifies, yet that it does not justify without works; that grace does not depend on the sacraments, yet is not given without them; that bishops are a divine ordinance, yet those who have them not are in the same religious condition as those who have; — this state of things cannot go on if men are to read and think. They cannot go on forever standing on one leg, or sitting without a chair, or walking with their feet tied, or grazing like Tityrus' stags in the air. They will take one view or other, but it will be a consistent view."[1]

[1] Apologia, p. 144.

Those who fell heir to this contemptuous gift brought it to America. Upon its arrival here it found, in rough, three classes of Churchmen, at whose hands it received a various reception.[1]

The *Via Media* in America.

There were, *first*, the Evangelicals, who had drawn their inspiration from the same pietistic revival which had originally revolted the Tractarians. These turned away from it with anger and contempt. To their minds the very principle of authority was abhorrent, and of all authorities, ecclesiastical was the worst.

There were, *second*, the Laudian, non-juring, Seabury type, who gave it a guarded and cautious welcome. Its seeming reverence for antiquity appeared to them to be a desirable re-enforcement to their spirit of conservatism. But this class was small in numbers and in influence. The men who had once belonged to it had been succeeded by men of Hobart's school. Their vigorous Americanism, and their absorption in practical work, prevented the mass of High Churchmen from becoming either doctrinaires or ritualists.

In the *third* place were the distinctly American Churchmen. The principle of Authority, in the Oxford sense, was not grateful to them; but they were accustomed to a legally regulated liberty. This class embraced a large proportion of the clergy and most of the laity. They had been accustomed to think and speak of themselves as Protestants. They possessed to a marked degree that broad, practical, clear-sighted wisdom which had belonged to the

American Churchmen.

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 192–4.

first generation of English reformers. They differed widely from their contemporary English Churchmen. There was hardly any class there to which they corresponded. They had not been reared upon Evangelicalism; but no more were they Anglo-Catholics. They called themselves Episcopalians. It was rather the Church's present life than its past history which attracted and held them. Antiquity did not, to their minds, carry obligation with it. They compared the Church with the other forms which Christianity presented here in America, and it commended itself to their judgments and consciences. They neither hailed nor feared the Oxford Movement for themselves, but they were often disturbed by the phenomena which it produced in the Church which they loved. Chiefly they feared that if it prevailed it would set the Church in hopeless antagonism to their Protestant neighbors. For, while they did not declaim against the Pope, and thought it ill-bred to call Rome the scarlet whore, they did not shut their eyes to the fact that they were more akin to Protestantism than they were to her.

But from all of these groups the movement drew recruits. It drew as with a magnet a certain type of men. They who loved symmetry of doctrine so much that they could hold to a system in spite of the contradictory facts of human life; they who distrusted themselves and shrank from the labor of ordering their own religious conduct; they whose imagination was kindled by the thought of a visible, holy, dominant, spiritual mistress, — these were attracted by that method of living whose rationale had been stated in Dean Hook's

sermon before the Queen, "Hear the Church."[1] This principle being accepted, an importance and a value were attributed to the rules, rituals, ordinances, and offices of the Church, which these did not have before. They became obligatory, not only or chiefly because they were intrinsically fit or excellent, but because they were of authority. Possessing such wisdom and power, the "Church" should, through her ordinances and officials, touch each soul at every point and moment of its earthly history.

Anglo-Catholics.

That no objective fact does now, or ever has, corresponded to this ideal of the "Church," did not disturb those who were under the domination of the idea. They chose from one century of the past one feature, and another from another, and combined them into their *simulacrum*. They were not in love, after all, with any outward mistress, but with an inward habit of prostration. Nor did the fact that Newman had declared the position indefensible, and abandoned it, disturb them. They were not logicians. They had not been drawn to their position by argument, nor would they be driven from it by a syllogism. Their instinct was wiser than their acts. The vitality of the movement lay in the fact that it was an honestly meant attempt to bring the Church of England out of its isolation, and into harmony with the Christian life of the ages. But they who joined in it became so engrossed with the task of re-establishing connection with the past that they fell out of sympathy with the Christian life of the present. They adopted an offen-

[1] Stephens: Life of Dean Hook, p. 251.

sive cant. Terms so old that they had become new and strange found the place of honor in their vocabulary. The very term "catholic" upon their lips misled. Their whole speech was strange. Their peculiar distribution of emphasis among doctrines; their manner of conducting services; the way in which they set forth the Church's attitude to the Christian world, — all these raised a storm of strife which lasted half a century. Bishops charged against them;[1] and bishops came to their rescue.[2] Bishop McIlvaine controverted the new views in his "Oxford Theology." Dr. Sparrow dissected them in his class-room at the Virginia Seminary. Dr. John S. Stone, in his "Christian Sacraments," said the final word for the Evangelical side. The Evangelical Knowledge Society was founded as a counteracting propaganda.

Time of strife.

On the other side Dr. Hugh Davey Evans spoke the most potent words in "The True Catholic." Dr. Kip sent forth the "Double Witness of the Church." Dr. Wainwright defended the position that "There cannot be a Church without a Bishop."[3]

In all this the good providence, which had been working fifty years to cement the loose federation into a compact whole, became evident. A generation earlier, the same strain would have rent the Church in pieces. Had the State autonomy, which once existed, still survived, the bond of union would have snapped. In 1844, the

[1] Beardsley: History of Church in Connecticut, vol. ii. p. 329.
[1] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 258.
[1] Green: Life of Bishop Otey, p. 66.
[2] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 269.
[3] Julius H. Ward, in Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 619.

matter was brought formally before the General Convention.[1] The Church was asked to speak her mind upon "the serious errors in doctrine which have within a few years been introduced and extensively promulgated by means of tracts, the press, and the pulpit." After days of debate, with resolutions, amendments, amendments to amendments, substitutes and divisions, the Convention dismissed the subject with the declaration, in effect, that the Church's formularies show her doctrine clearly enough for any one to comprehend who wants to comprehend; and that "the Church is not responsible for the errors of individuals, whether they be members of this Church or not." [2]

Whether the things in dispute were really "errors" in doctrine remained undecided. It remains undecided yet. But it seemed clear to most that their introduction imported grave danger to the Church. It was feared that they would make of her a training-school for Rome. For some years, that seemed likely. For two centuries the Roman Church had been a feeble and insignificant factor in American life. With the decadence of Lord Baltimore's colony in the seventeenth century, it had well-nigh gone out. But its hierarchy had now been established for more than sixty years. During these years it had grown so slowly that it had attracted little attention. But when the tide of Irish immigration set in in 1848, Romanism began to flourish. Anglo-Catholicism and Roman Catholicism came in together. Many feared that there was a relationship

[1] Gen. Con. Journal, 1844.
[2] Ib.

between them. It began to seem so.[1] In England, as a direct consequence of the revived ecclesiasticism, such great names as Newman, Manning, Oakley, Faber, Wilberforce, Palmer, and Ward passed from the Church's rolls to the lists of Rome. In America, Bishop Ives of North Carolina, and a group of men of lesser station but greater character, followed in the same path. But the general apostacy for which many looked did not occur. The facts seemed to point to a different outcome, as the event has shown. The sum total of the losses to the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain up to 1888, including clergy and laity, men and women, falls below two thousand. That is to say, an average of thirty-five persons per year have left the Church of England for Rome during the last sixty years. One large parish church would hold them all, living and dead. The loss from the American Church has been much less, both absolutely and in proportion. Nor is it speaking beyond bounds to say that for every one thus lost, five have come from Rome to the Church. The defection was greatest at its beginning, both in numbers and still more in quality. Since then it has steadily fallen off.[2]

Converts and perverts.

How much of the revived ecclesiasticism which marks the century is to be referred to the Oxford Movement, and

[1] Brand: Life of Bishop Whittingham, vol. ii. p. 353, *et seq.*

[2] Quarterly Review, No. 331, p. 31, *et seq.*

[2] *Cf.* Our Losses, a letter to the Rev. J. A. Canon Wenham, by Rev. G. Bampfield.

Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Scotland: by W. Maziere Brady.

Converts to Rome: W. Gordon Gorman.

The Present State of the Church in England: by Lord Bray.

The Catholic Directory: London, 1388.

how much to the influences at work antecedently and outside of it, cannot be known. Nor can the goal to which it tends be clearly seen as yet. The process had not run its course within the period of this book. It has not done so yet. But it affected the Protestant Episcopal Church profoundly, both for good and ill. On the one hand, it recalled men from the selfish pursuit of salvation as isolated individuals, and warned them that even in religion "no man liveth unto himself alone." It brought into clear view the obscured truth of the community of the saints, *semper*, *ubique*, *et ab omnibus*. It imported a new reverence into divine worship and uncovered the meaning of Christ's Sacraments.

Good and evil of the movement.

On the other hand, it segregated the Church Catholic too sharply from the common moral life of humanity. It placed the Episcopal Church in a false attitude towards its contemporaries. It produced a timid, ecclesiastical temper. It tempted men to say, "Master, we saw one casting out devils, and we forbade him because he followeth not with us." A century earlier, in Pennsylvania and Delaware, the Swedish clergy entered the Church without question asked on either side. While the Tractarians were students of divinity, the High Churchman Bishop Ravenscroft of North Carolina did not hesitate to join with the Moravian Bishop Benade in the Holy Eucharist.[1] Without any change of law, this hospitable attitude was lost. The loss was great to all concerned.

Meanwhile the Church proceeded on her way sadly distracted with the strife of tongues.

[1] Norton: Life of Bishop Ravenscroft, p. 126.

CHAPTER X.

A PLACE WHERE TWO WAYS MEET.

When the catholic nature of the Church came to be more clearly seen, it became evident that the Protestant Episcopal Church did not adequately represent the ideal. The isolation in the Christian world, which had been its fortune for three hundred years, had affected it in mind and structure. It was organized and equipped as a sect, and to do a sect's work. Its awakened sense of catholicity required a broader outlook. It must establish relations with society. *Noblesse oblige.* But the common people of America were indifferent or antipathetic. The same movement which had brought the Church to a better understanding of herself had operated to turn the people from her. The ratio of growth was steadily declining.[1] The population was advancing with gigantic strides. The Church crept tardily after. The people neither understood nor cared for her. The more her children loved and believed in her, the more they grieved. The people would not weep to her mourning or dance to her piping. The fault could not be lack of zeal, for no class of men could be found more earnest or tireless than her ministers. Twenty

Falling behind the population.

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 382.

years before, the Church had formally declared that all her children were missionaries by virtue of their baptism. It had undertaken in its organized capacity to win the nation. Who could be more zealous than Polk, more faithful than Whittingham, more apostolic than Kemper, more saintly than Otey, or wiser than De Lancey? But still the Church's growth was not commensurate either with her own character or with the energy expended. The controversialists on either hand were not seriously disturbed. Their thoughts were engrossed. But a class of men, inspired with a deep feeling of the Church's real work in the nation, pondered the matter deeply. Two men — the greatest the American Church has yet produced — saw the situation more clearly than their fellows. Dr. Muhlenberg perceived it as a seer; Bishop Alonzo Potter saw it as a statesman. The Church's theory was catholic; her methods were denominational. The head and the hands were not in harmony, and the heart was torn between them. Wise men had discovered the evil and tried to find a cure. The *New York Review* (1837–1842) had tried to bring the Church into touch with the thought of the time. Dr. Muhlenberg, in the *Evangelical Catholic*, had set out her place in Christian society with a wealth of thought and charm of spirit never since equalled. His voice had not been noticed in the din of controversy, but he had spoken the thought of the best and wisest men in the Church.

A Church or a sect?

When the General Convention met in 1853, the following *Memorial* was laid before the House of Bishops: —

RIGHT REVEREND FATHERS: — The undersigned, presbyters of the Church of which you have the oversight, venture to approach your venerable body with a sentiment which their estimate of your office in relation to the times does not permit them to withhold. In so doing they have confidence in your readiness to appreciate their motives and their aims.

The Memorial.

The actual posture of our Church, with reference to the great moral and social necessities of the day, presents to the minds of the undersigned a subject of grave and anxious thought. Did they suppose that this was confined to themselves they would not feel warranted in submitting it to your attention; but they believe it to be participated in by many of their brethren, who may not have seen the expediency of declaring their views, or at least a mature season for such a course.

The divided and distracted state of our American Protestant Christianity; the new and subtle forms of unbelief, adapting themselves with fatal success to the spirit of the age; the consolidated forces of Romanism, bearing with renewed skill and activity against the Protestant faith: and, as more or less the consequence of these, the utter ignorance of the Gospel among so large a portion of the lower classes of our population, making a heathen world in our midst; are among the considerations which induce your memorialists to present the inquiry whether the period has not arrived for the adoption of measures, to meet these exigencies of the times, more comprehensive than any yet provided for by our present ecclesiastical system; In other words, whether the Protestant Episcopal Church, with only her present canonical means and appliances, her fixed and invariable modes of public worship, her traditional customs and usages, is competent to the work of

preaching and dispensing the Gospel to all sorts and conditions of men, and so, adequate to do the work of the Lord in this land and in this age? This question, your petitioners for their own part, and in consonance with many thoughtful minds among us, believe must be answered in the negative. Their memorial proceeds on the assumption that our Church, confined to the exercises of her present system, is not sufficient to the great purposes above mentioned; that a wider door must be opened for the admission to the Gospel ministry than that through which her candidates for holy orders are now obliged to enter. Besides such candidates among her own members, it is believed that men can be found among the other bodies of Christians around us, who would gladly receive ordination at your hands, could they obtain it without that entire surrender, which would now be required of them, of *all* the liberty in public worship to which they have been accustomed; men, who could not bring themselves to conform in all particulars to our prescriptions and customs, but yet sound in the faith, and who, having the gifts of preachers and pastors, would be able ministers of the New Testament. With deference it is asked, ought such an accession to your means in executing your high commission, "Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," be refused, for the sake of conformity in matters recognized in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer as unessentials? Dare we pray the Lord of harvests to send forth laborers into the harvest, while we reject all laborers but those of one peculiar type? The extension of orders to the class of men contemplated (with whatever safeguards, not infringing on evangelical freedom, which your wisdom might deem expedient), appears to your petitioners to be a subject supremely worthy of your deliberations.

In addition to the prospect of the immediate good which would thus be opened, an important step would be taken towards the effecting of a Church unity in the Protestant Christendom of our land. To become a central bond of union among Christians, who, though differing in name, yet hold to the one Faith, the one Lord, the one Baptism; and, who need only such a bond to be drawn together in closer and more primitive fellowship, is here believed to be the peculiar province and high privilege of your venerable body as a college of *Catholic and Apostolic Bishops as such.*

This leads your petitioners to declare the ultimate design of their memorial; which is to submit the practicability, under your auspices, of some ecclesiastical system, broader and more comprehensive than that which you now administer, surrounding and including the Protestant Episcopal Church as it now is, leaving that church untouched, identical with that church in all its great principles, yet providing for as much freedom in opinion, discipline, and worship, as is compatible with the essential faith and order of the Gospel. To define and act upon such a system, it is believed, must sooner or later be the work of an American Catholic Episcopate.

In justice to themselves, on this occasion, your memorialists beg leave to remark that, although aware that the foregoing views are not confined to their own small number, they have no reason to suppose that any other parties contemplate a public expression of them, like the present. Having therefore undertaken it, they trust that they have not laid themselves open to the charge of unwarrantable intrusion. They find their warrant in the prayer now offered up by all congregations, "that the comfortable Gospel of Christ may be truly preached, truly received,

and truly followed in all places, to the breaking down the kingdom of Sin, Satan, and Death." Convinced that, for the attainment of these blessed ends, there must be some greater concert of action among Protestant Christians than any which yet exists, and believing that with you, Right Reverend Fathers, it rests to take the first measures tending thereto, we could do no less than humbly submit this memorial to such consideration as in your wisdom you may see fit to give it.

Assuring you, Right Reverend Fathers, of our dutiful veneration and esteem,

We are, most respectfully,

Your Brethren and Servants in the Gospel of Christ:

W. A. Muhlenberg,	C. F. Cruse,
Philip Berry,	Edwin Harwood,
G. T. Bedell,	Henry Gregory,
Alex. H. Vinton,	M. A. DeWolfe Howe,
S. H. Turner,	S. R. Johnson,
C. W. Andrews.	F. E. Lawrence,

and others.

Concurring in the main purport of the memorial, but not able to subscribe to all its details, the following names were subscribed:

John Henry Hobart,	A. Cleveland Coxe,
E. Y. Higbee,	Francis Vinton,
Isaac G. Hubbard,	*and others.*

What the Memorialists proposed was at once simple and revolutionary. They meant, in good faith, to put the catholic theory of the Church to the *experimentum crucis*. "The great catholic idea of the Church may be

fully developed by more thoroughly adapting it to all the wants of the country and the times." [1] Their objective point was the emancipation of the Episcopate.[2]

Emancipation of bishops.

Their action had other aims as well, but this was the chief. The Episcopate was the differentiate of the Church in America. In Rome it was in subjection to the Pope. In England it was fettered by the State. Here it was tied by conventional rules, so that it was powerless to act beyond the borders of the Protestant Episcopal sect, and even within them was checked at every turn. Protestants might stretch out their hands for it in vain. It must be refused unless they would consent to take with it all the peculiarities of the sect which possessed it. This, the Memorialists maintained, was uncatholic. They saw, farther, that if the Episcopate should continue to be deprived of its original powers, and reduced to an office of petty routine, it would soon come to be filled by petty men. They believed that to claim for the office a divine grace, and then to bind it into helplessness from fear of the human infirmities of the men who filled it, was but solemn trifling.

In the second place, they asserted that the Liturgy,[3] which they themselves delighted in, was a stumbling-

Loosening of rubrics.

block to thousands, who, but for it, would accept the essentials of the Church; that the principle of compulsory uniformity upon which the Church was acting, was not only uncatholic but foolish;

[1] Resolution of Rhode Island Diocese, 1856.
[2] Evangelical Catholic Papers, p. 181.
[3] Ib., p. 163, *et seq.*

that the Prayer-Book was constructed for the use of well-ordered and well-trained parishes, whereas the Church's work would be, for many a day to come, among those whose customs and prejudices rendered it ungrateful to them; that as "good wine needs no bush," the Liturgy might be trusted to make its own way into general use by its own intrinsic excellence.

A third purpose was to restore a disused force by reviving the lower order of the ministry. There were then but thirty-seven deacons in the Church; there should, and might readily have been, five thousand. The ministry was practically closed against all applicants save a small class of men, with peculiar qualifications, hard to attain, and not guaranteeing efficiency when attained. The various sections of the broad vineyard demanded laborers of various sorts. The masses of the people could not be touched but by men from among themselves. A deacon's work required character rather than education,[1] and tent-makers might yet work with their own hands, not being chargeable to any man, and still be apostolic. Above all, they lamented that the door was barred against the ministers of the Protestant world. One of these could enter only "by painful steps and slow." While waiting the long period of probation, — a probation not required of a Roman priest of far inferior character, — he became separated from his own people, so that he must come alone and a stranger.

Revival of the Diaconate.

The ultimate object toward which all their aims

[1] Howe: Memoirs of Bishop Alonzo Potter, p. 185.

pointed was the Unity of Protestant Christendom.[1] The Protestant Episcopal Church, standing as the representative of Catholicity in America, had her task assigned by God. She was to keep open communication with the past. She was to be the *tertium quid* to produce union in the present.

Church unity.

But to do this last she must move freely among the broken mass. This, the Memorialists contended, she could not do under her present self-imposed limitations.

The Memorial was received by the Convention with the consideration which the names of its signers could not but secure. It was referred to a committee composed of Bishops Otey, Doane, Alonzo Potter, Burgess, Williams, and Wainwright.[2] They were instructed to report to the next Convention. Bishop Alonzo Potter took charge of the measure, became its advocate, counsellor, and historian.[3] It at once arrested the attention of the whole Church. For several years little else was thought or spoken of. Especially among the younger clergy and laymen did it commend itself.[4] Diocesan conventions discussed it, and passed resolutions for or against its proposals.[5] Church newspapers advocated or denounced it. Sermons, pamphlets, magazine articles, and books were written about it. The committee which had it in charge circulated a list of questions concerning it, to which they solicited replies.

[1] Evangelical Catholic Papers, p. 322.

[2] Memorial Papers: with an introduction by Right Rev. Alonzo Potter, Philadelphia, 1857, p. 36.

[3] Memorial Papers.

[4] Ib., p. vii.

[5] Green: Life of Bishop Otey, p. 60.

These questions show that the members of the committee either but dimly appreciated its import, or else did not care to consider the fundamental problems at issue. They relate for the most part to details of subordinate importance.[1] The replies they received are directed some to one and some to another of the queries, and some to the principles involved.[2]

Bishop Doane of New Jersey, in his reply, falls foul of Sunday-schools, as being destructive of home training of children, advocates parish schools wherein the youth of the country may be taught in the spirit of the Church; and recommends that schools of theology be multiplied and localized in various sections of the country, so that the ministry may be more in touch with the people whom it is called to serve.

Divers opinions.

Bishop Potter of Pennsylvania alone goes to the root of the matter. He advises: to leave to each diocese the power to fix the terms of admission to its own ministry, as best knowing its own needs; to receive Protestant ministers whenever they are ready and fit to come, the diocesan authorities passing upon each case as it arises; to exploit the plan of an unlearned diaconate as proposed in 1853, allowing each diocese to receive its own, and not compelling any other diocese to accept them for duty; leave congregations which are ready to receive an episcopally ordained minister to use the Liturgy or not as they see fit, — as Bishop Kemper had so wisely done with the Swedish and Norwegian

1 Memorial Papers, pp. 37–40.

2 The substance of the answers is in all cases condensed from the papers edited and published by Bishop Potter as Memorial Papers.

Lutherans in Wisconsin; abandon the idea of enforced uniformity in worship, as uncatholic and disastrous wherever it has been attempted.

Bishop Burgess of Maine recommends to revise the Liturgy so as to make it more fit, and, having done so, exact its use; when it has been used in any case, allow supplementary extemporary prayers.

Bishop Williams of Connecticut advises district visiting; that missionary priests are indeed needed, but must be chosen according to a universal standard, and sent under diocesan control. As to unlearned deacons, he doubts, but if there should be such, they must withdraw from secular employment. He had "prepared some further remarks on the general subject of Christian unity, designed to show that restraints, doctrinal and other, under which we are placed, are not mere accidents, and indications of sectarianism, taken up at will, but things rendered necessary by the abnormal condition of Christendom, and forming part and parcel of our true Catholicity," — but omits them for lack of space.

Bishop Meade of Virginia believes that the services are too long; that the minister should be allowed to select the psalms; that there should be liberty to omit the term "regenerate" in baptism.

Bishop Polk replies that among the people of the Southwest the Liturgy is a distinct hindrance; that it is too long, and the rubrics too rigid; that it should be left more to the discretion of the minister; that many of his people cannot read at all; that a learned and an unlearned ministry are both needed.

Bishop Freeman was opposed to the whole agitation; "would never consent to touch in the minutest particular the integrity of the Liturgy;" would allow no "relaxation whatever in the conditions of admitting other ministers;—they do not want to come any way."

Bishop Upfold denies the premises; the Church has, all things considered, grown wonderfully; would not consent to touch the Liturgy; would make the terms of admission for other ministers harder than they are.

Bishop Scott denies the premises; would allow no relaxation even if they were true.

Dr. Bowman thinks the memorialists should be content with the unlearned diaconate.

Dr. Coxe recommends a primer where the Liturgy cannot be used; and calls attention to the Moravian Church as a factor in the problem of unity.

Dr. Craik thinks that the door towards Protestantism is too wide open already; better that some within were shut outside.

Dr. Francis Vinton believes that the whole jurisdiction in the province of ordination should be left with the bishop, to whom it inherently belongs; that the General Convention had acted *ultra vires* in its legislation upon the matter; that the bishop should ordain fit men, and then be only too glad to have them serve Presbyterian or other congregations if they had the chance, without any question of the use of the Liturgy.

A Presbyterian divine says the safety of the sects (*sic*) depends upon the continued rigidity of the Church; if that should be abandoned, their existence would be endangered.

A Congregational divine indorses the position of the memorialists as being in the general interest of American Christianity.

A Baptist divine asserts that if the Church could but find a way to reach the masses she could effect more than all others.

A German Reformed divine states that they also are preparing a Liturgy, and would gladly draw nearer to the Church.

A Methodist divine answers that the Church possesses those things which are abiding, and the Methodists those which are discretionary; that each might help the other.

The Committee, having thus gathered opinions from those whom they thought best qualified to speak, and having listened to the discussion which for three years had filled the air, reported to the General Convention of 1856, that the statements of the Memorialists were true; that "the Church is by no means keeping pace with the population;" that the "growth in the last half-century furnishes matter of deep humiliation and shame;" that the Liturgy is not suited to all the work required of it; that both diocesan conventions and representative men agree as to the facts of the case; that there is a wide-spread desire for a more efficient policy.

A true bill found.

In the way of cure, they recommend extemporaneous preaching; lay work; sisterhoods; more frequent services; a more hospitable bearing toward other churches; a formal declaration by the House of Bishops that Morning Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion are

distinct services, and need not be said together; a standing committee of five bishops to receive proposals concerning Christian unity; to allow diocesan bishops the power to set forth services for special occasions.

The recommendations were all adopted, — and the situation remained unchanged. The action failed to touch the issue. Dr. Muhlenberg wrote, "It is the genius of Catholicity now knocking at the Church's doors. Let her refuse to open. Let her, if she will, make them faster still, with new bolts and bars, and then take her rest, to dream a wilder dream than any of the Memorial: of becoming the Catholic Church of these United States." [1]

Twenty years later, Dr. Washburn declared that "had the Memorial prevailed, we should have been spared the two worst misfortunes which have since befallen us. The conscientious men of ritualistic type, instead of defying law for chasubles and candles, would have thrown their devotion into noble work; and the conscientious men who have only added another Reformed Episcopal fragment to the atoms floating in Christian space would have remained content with just freedom." [2] The Church had the choice set before her to be Catholic or to be sectarian. She chose the latter. She exalted her customs above her principles. The choice threw her back more than a generation.

A fatal choice.

Men being what they are, no other choice could well have been expected. The Lower House had already

[1] Evangelical Catholic Papers, p. 325.
[2] Ayres: Life of Dr. Muhlenberg, p. 273.

begun to think of itself as the Church. It was jealous of Episcopal prerogative, and out of touch with the people. While the Church remained a federation of States neither of these mistakes was possible. Each delegation then instinctively sought to know and do the will of its own people. That allegiance had been insensibly withdrawn from the local church and given to the general body. The people of the dioceses had come to be the constituencies; but the representation had not yet been apportioned to their numbers. The General Convention grew remote. The time came when its deliverances were little heeded. It came to have a life of its own, apart from the common life of the Church. It feared anything which might derange that life. A catholic policy would surely have done so. Party leaders in it feared what might prove to be an opponent's advantage. Men were not willing to intrust others with a liberty which they would have welcomed for themselves. Timidity, miscalled conservatism, shrank from change. As always, men whose vision is acute within a narrow range refused to trust the sight of others who were able to see the end. The Church acquiesced in the decision, as it would have done in its opposite. But the opportunity had been lost. The Church had not been able to see the things which belonged to her peace.

Spirit of General Convention.

The canon allowing an unlearned diaconate was passed; but it proved an empty gain.[1] It was an instrument which would not operate in the machinery of which it formed a part. It was discredited from the

[1] Howe: Memoirs of Bishop Alonzo Potter, p. 186.

start. Some bishops would not use it when they could; others could not when they would. Its necessity was presently obscured by the makeshift of "licensed lay readers," — as if any license were needed for a layman to do his ordinary duty.

It remained for another generation of men, spiritual sons of the Memorialists, to take up again the work of Liturgical revision and Christian Unity. Dr. Muhlenberg retired to his schools, his hospitals, his free church. Bishop Potter took up again his labor of organizing the religious life, leading the thought, and caring for the poor of his great diocese. Their associates stood in their own lots, exemplifying catholicity in life and work. The Church held on her narrow way. Within the limits she had fixed for herself, her life was active, and, judged by her own standard, successful. The general religious movement of the land went on its course, little affected by her. But she was not unmindful of the spiritual needs of her own children, either in the old States or in the far West.

Progress in a narrow path.

The same Convention which received the Memorial sent two bishops to the Pacific Coast. California was then four months' journey from New York. Population was pouring into it from all four quarters of the globe. Long lines of "prairie schooners" were winding their tedious way across the plains of Kansas and Nebraska, through the passes of the Rocky Mountains, and down the slopes of the Sierras, carrying the seekers after gold. Another stream was struggling through the swamps and miasmas of "the Isthmus," and still another battling its stormy path

"around the Horn," to the same El Dorado. Its rough, turbulent, picturesque life was at its height. Among the earliest comers were clergy of the Church. The Rev. Dr. Ver Mehr was among the "forty-niners." He gathered a little congregation, and held services in a rude San Francisco shanty. Things moved rapidly there. In 1850 the first "Convention of the Church in California" was held in San Francisco, and six clergy were present. It did not regard itself as a part of the Church in the United States. It was an independent organization, and looked at first to the Greek Church for the Episcopate.[1] It was far nearer, geographically, to the Greek Church in Alaska than to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States. But when three years more had passed, the swift changes of population which marked the time and place had left the Church almost extinct. Some of the clergy were sick, some dead, some moved away, and some smitten with the "gold fever." In 1853 the General Convention chose the Rev. Dr. Kip as bishop, and sent him to build the Protestant Episcopal Church in California.

Church in California.

In 1851 the Board of Missions sent the Rev. William Richmond to Oregon. When he arrived, he found St. Michael Fackler, a faithful priest from Missouri, living and working in Willamette Valley. In 1853, three clergy and seven laymen met at Oregon City and organized the Church in Oregon. The same year, the General Convention chose the Rev. Dr. Thomas Fielding Scott to be its bishop.

Church in Oregon.

Iowa, Texas, Minnesota, and Arkansas were, a few

[1] Bishop Kip, in Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 314.

years later, detached from the great Missionary Jurisdictions, and placed under bishops of their own.

But the thought and energy of the time were being more and more withdrawn from the affairs of the Church, and absorbed in the condition of the nation. The mutterings of the coming storm of war were already heard. It was possible that the American Church might soon be broken up together with the nation in which it dwelt.

CHAPTER XI.

IN WAR TIME.

Division of Churches upon slavery.

THE same institution whose presence in America ultimately caused secession had long before caused ecclesiastical divisions. The "great secession" in 1845 had split the Methodist Church in two. One of its bishops had been found to be "an owner of slaves, by marriage."[1] He was required to purge himself of his fault or lay down his office. The Southern delegates stood by him, and the Methodist Church South was organized.

In 1857 the "New School Presbyterian Church" took similar ground in an expression of opinion upon the Fugitive Slave Law, whereupon several Southern presbyteries withdrew from their connection, and became the nucleus around which the Southern Presbyterian Church was built in 1861.[2]

Among the Baptists, and all denominations of Congregational type, there had been, of course, no formal separation, for there had never been any organic union, but their formal "fellowship" had long stopped at Mason and Dixon's line.

The Church of Rome had never divided upon the question for quite a different reason. Her unity has

[1] Stevens: American Methodism, pp. 525-6.
[2] Schaff-Herzog Encycl., p. 1908.

nothing to do with the unity of national life, but is centred in a foreign potentate. But all American churches, except the Protestant Episcopal, had ranged themselves toward the same question of negro slavery, which was working to a settlement in the national life.

These foregone ecclesiastical divisions had much to do with making political separation possible.[1] They had familiarized people's minds with the idea. They had withdrawn members of the same spiritual family so far away from each other that mutual understanding became impossible.

Episcopal Church not divided.

In the Episcopal Church this was not the case. Its members North and South were in more friendly relation, and had a better comprehension of each other's thought upon the fundamental question, than had the members of any other organization, religious or secular. The Church had never called slave-holding a sin. It had never made it a matter of discipline. It saw more clearly than did the divided denominations what were the real difficulties involved in its settlement. At the organization of the Church, its members felt about the matter as did the great mass of the Christian people of their time. Slavery was then common to all the colonies. It was accepted as part of the constitution of things. Its practical evils were evident to many, but in itself it was generally accepted to be warranted by Scripture and ancient custom. But a sentiment against it was even then rising. The social and political ills attached to the institution were becoming apparent. There was an

[1] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, pp. 492, 494.

instinct that it was antagonistic to the fundamental conception of American political life. This sentiment gained ground slowly, but surely, in the Northern States. As it spread it produced gradual emancipation. But this had taken effect so recently in many Northern States that the old way of regarding slavery, in theory, had not been changed. It had been seen to be practicably undesirable, but not morally indefensible. The great mass of Northern people did not think themselves to be partakers of other men's sins by living in a government which permitted it within its borders. They did not forget that they had lately shared the sin, if it were one. So late as 1850 there were still slaves in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.[1] In 1860 there were still living in the prime of life colored men who had been born bondsmen in the Northern States. But for a generation the relation of the general government toward slavery had been the burning question. It had engaged men's thoughts and emotions far more deeply than any issue that has confronted them, before or since. The Church was blamed for her attitude. Some of her own children thought and spoke of her with shame. They begged her to bear her testimony against this "sum of all villanies;" to break out of this "league with death and covenant with hell." The great Bishop Wilberforce exclaims with horror that "the Spirit of Missions, edited with the sanction of the Church, and under the eye of the Bishop of New York, proposes to

General sentiment of the Church.

The Church blamed.

[1] Williams: History of the Negro Race in America, vol. ii. p. 99. This history, written by a negro, a member of the Ohio Legislature, is valuable in many regards.

endow a mission school in Louisiana with a plantation to be worked by slaves."[1] Churchmen offered no protest when the Bishop of Georgia proposed to maintain the "Montpelier Institute" by slave labor, or when the Bishop of South Carolina denounced the "malignant philanthropy of abolition." With the Abolitionists as a party, the Church had but little sympathy. The intemperance of their denunciations, their incapacity to understand the facts, their close affiliation with infidelity,[2] all offended her. Church people held rather with President Lincoln. They saw the evils of the institution, and looked for its abolition, but they saw also how closely it was interwoven with the structure of society, and were not ready for heroic surgery.[3] The Church preserved the same policy toward slavery that she has always done toward intemperance and poverty. They are evils to be eradicated by strengthening the constitutional life, rather than by the exhibition of specifics.

The manner of life in the South was more familiar to her than it was to any other religious body. There had been no separation or cessation of intercourse. Every three years the representatives of all the dioceses sat together for weeks in General Convention. The bishops, North and South, were in constant correspondence, Meade with M'Ilvaine,

Mutual comprehension.

[1] Wilberforce: History of the American Church, p. 427.

The writer has but seldom referred to Bishop Wilberforce's History. It is not of great value. It bears the mark of the haste with which it was prepared, and the scantiness of the authorities at its author's command. See Life of Bishop Wilberforce, p. 87.

[2] Caswall: American Church and Union, p. 278.

[3] Nicolay and Hay: Life of Abraham Lincoln, *in loc.*

[3] Raymond: Life and State Papers of Abraham Lincoln, p. 759.

Whittingham with Hopkins.[1] The Bishops of Virginia, Ohio, Tennessee, and Louisiana had kept the promise mutually given long before that they would pray for each other by name every Sunday morning.[2] Each section was fully aware of the others' sentiments. Northern Churchmen had often heard the Bishop of Virginia say, and in general they agreed with him, that slavery was never to his taste; but that he had no conscientious scruples as to its lawfulness.[3] They knew that he had, like many others, emancipated slaves himself, only to find the poor creatures helpless vagabonds in the midst of a slave-holding community.[4] Indeed, manumission of individuals was a very doubtful kindness. When that sturdy Vermonter, Bishop Chase, went to live in New Orleans, he was compelled to purchase his negro Jack, because he could not obtain a servant in any other way. But having ended his residence there, he was at his wit's end to know what to do with Jack.[5] Northern Churchmen knew that their brethren in the South were not altogether unmindful of the religious welfare of their slaves. They knew that in South Carolina there were a hundred and fifty congregations of negroes for a hundred of whites;[6] that the Bishop of Virginia had preached his Convention Sermon upon the duty owed by the whites to negroes; that thousands of them were regular and faithful communicants.

[1] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 492.
[2] Ib., p. 237.
[3] Ib., p. 476.
[4] Caswall: American Church and Union, p. 276.
[5] Chase: Reminiscences, vol. i. p. 75.
[6] Caswall: p. 273.

All these things did not change their opinion of slavery. It was bad, only bad, and that continually. But this mutual understanding and sympathy kept the Church together while the Union lasted, and brought it together again as soon as that was restored.

In 1860 it became evident that a slave-holding people and a free people would not live in the same house.

Southern bishops oppose secession.

But when secession was first proposed it was strenuously resisted by the leading Southern bishops. The Bishop of Virginia used his great influence against it.[1] The Bishop of Maryland was still more outspoken, and remained steadfast to the Union through all.[2] In its defence he sacrificed the love of lifelong friends, and nearly broke his heart. Otey of Tennessee wrote to Bishop Polk, "It is God alone that can still the madness of the people. To what quarter shall we look when such men as you and Elliott deliberately favor secession? What can we expect, other than violence among the masses, when the fathers of the land openly avow their determination to destroy the work which their fathers established at the expense of their blood?"[3]

But when secession became a political fact, the Southern Churchmen maintained that it carried with it ecclesiastical separation. They contended that they had no choice. When the States in which they lived went out of the Union, they bore the Church with them

[1] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, p. 492. "You see that I am almost in despair. I am told that our clergy in Charleston preach in favor of disunion. I fear some of our bishops consent, or why have I heard of no remonstrance?"

[2] Brand: Life of Bishop Whittingham, vol. ii. pp. 11, 20.

[3] Green: Life of Bishop Otey, p. 90.

as really as a ship bears her company out to sea. To their minds the separation was as complete as though a physical chasm had suddenly yawned between the North and the South.[1] Bishops Polk and Elliott say in a circular letter, "This necessity does not arise out of any division which has occurred within the Church itself, nor from any dissatisfaction with either the doctrine or discipline of the Church. We rejoice to record that we are to-day, as Churchmen, as truly brethren as we have ever been, and that no deed has been done, or word uttered, which leaves a single wound rankling in any breast." The Southern Churchmen had retained the original idea that the general Church was made by a voluntary compact of autonomous State Churches, long after that idea had faded out of mind in the North. Bishop Meade had not taken kindly to the General Missionary Society, and had opposed the General Seminary for this very reason. They seemed to him to be movements toward a centralization which he believed to be contrary both to the spirit and the policy of the Church.[2] When the States seceded one by one, the Churches within them reverted to their primitive diocesan independence. No violent revolution in their ecclesiastical ideas was needed to bring them into harmony with their new situation. When the States confederated themselves into a new nation, it was the most natural thing for the dioceses to confederate themselves into a new Church.

Southern idea of the Church and the States.

[1] Wilmer: The Recent Past, p. 226.
"As if an abyss had suddenly yawned between the two sections."

[2] Johns: Life of Bishop Meade, pp. 109, 504.

All their previous habits of thought made the way easy for them.[1]

Secession.

When the General Convention met in New York in 1862, the chasm had opened between the two sections, and war was already raging. The Southern dioceses were absent. What should the Church do in this new exigency?

Once, long before, the delegates from a geographical section had been absent. A belt of yellow fever had cut off New England from the other States. At that time, the Church had accepted the physical explanation, and proceeded without the absent brethren. The same thing was done now. The Convention tacitly adopted the same theory which had controlled the action of the Southern dioceses. There was a physical obstacle in the way of their coming. But every day the roll of all the States was called.[2] The delegates might come and take their seats if they would or could. The possibility of any diocese being voluntarily absent was ignored. By the next triennial Convention they had returned. The General Convention continued to act as the representative of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. The Nation did not acknowledge that any States had gone; no more did the Church.

The Church and the Union.

But it was confronted with the question of what was its duty to the Nation in this its hour of need. The deliverance of a body so influential as the Episcopal Church would carry weight, and was anxiously looked for. It was given without hesitation in favor of the Union. A committee

[1] Green: Life of Bishop Otey, p. 121.
[2] General Convention Journal, 1862.

of nine was appointed to prepare a fitting declaration.[1] When reported and adopted, after long and earnest discussion, it set forth: That obedience to civil authority is a Christian's duty and a Churchman's habit; that while the Convention had no hard words for its brethren in the South, it could not be blind to the fact that they were "in open and armed resistance to regularly constituted government;" that as individual citizens the members of the Convention will not be found wanting in word or deed to aid the country in its struggle; that as the council of a Church which hath ever renounced all political action, they can only pray that the National Government may be successful in this its rightful endeavor.

A lay deputy from Maryland opposed the action, on the ground that a Church council may not concern itself in any way with political questions. The Presiding Bishop, Hopkins of Vermont, took the same position, and refused to read the Pastoral Letter which expressed the same general sentiment of patriotism.[2] These objections were brushed aside. The issue was felt to be moral rather than political. Ecclesiastical precisians could not be heard upon it. The whole weight of the Church's influence, which was not small, was given to the Union side throughout the struggle. In the very darkest hour, when it became almost a matter of life or death to change the drift of English sympathy from the Southern to the Northern side, Bishop M'Ilvaine was one of the ambassadors at large to the English people,

[1] General Convention Journal, 1862.
[2] Brand: Life of Bishop Whittingham, vol. ii. p. 32.

chosen and informally accredited by President Lincoln. Together with Thurlow Weed, Henry Ward Beecher, and Archbishop Hughes, he went to England. He had entertained the Prince of Wales while visiting this country, and was well known among that class who most needed to be set right upon the true nature of the conflict. Few men effected more for the Union cause than did the Bishop of Ohio by this embassage.[1]

The Church in the Confederacy.

Meanwhile the absent dioceses had organized the Church in the Confederate States.[2] Its leaders were Polk, the Bishop of Louisiana, and Elliott, the Bishop of Georgia. The Bishop of Virginia was with them now in sympathy, but he was old and near to die. In March of 1861 Polk and Elliott met at Sewannee, Tenn., on business connected with the University of the South. By that time South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas had seceded. The Church in each was an ecclesiastical fragment, floating in space. They were only more fortunate than the colonists had been at the close of the Revolution, in that they had diocesan organizations and bishops. Some one must volunteer to lead them if they were to confederate. Polk and Elliott took up the task. They addressed a circular letter, asking each seceded diocese to send delegates to a conference to be held at Montgomery, Ala., in July. In response to their call thirty delegates came. Four bishops were present, Elliott of Georgia, Green of

[1] Dyer: Records of an Active Life, p. 280.

[2] The material for this sketch of the Church in the Confederate States is chiefly taken from a monograph of that title by the Rev. Dr. John Fulton in Perry's History of the American Church, vol. ii. pp. 561–592.

Mississippi, Rutledge of Florida, and Davis of South Carolina. Cobbs of Alabama had just died; Otey of Tennessee was ill; Meade of Virginia was old and infirm; Atkinson of North Carolina did not respond; Gregg of Texas was cut off by the blockade; Polk had entered the Confederate Army. Six dioceses were represented by clergy or laymen. All three orders sat in one House. There were no rules, in the nature of the case. The Convention was not a Church, but the material out of which one might be framed. They agreed that it was "necessary and expedient" that the dioceses of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the seceded States should form among themselves an independent organization. It was urged that the eyes of the Confederacy were upon them, and that they owed the new government the moral support which they could give it by acting as if they expected it to be abiding. An ecclesiastical reason also pressed. Alabama was without a bishop. If it should elect a man to that office, as was likely, who would take order for his consecration? The situation was difficult. The Convention was not large enough or representative enough to go forward to a complete organization; it was too large and too conspicuous to go back and leave nothing done. They therefore took a recess until the following October, appointing a committee, of three of each order, to prepare a constitution and canons meanwhile. When October came, all the States in the Confederacy were represented save Texas, and all the bishops present except General Polk. Then they went forward and adopted the constitution and canons, sub-

Organization.

stantially the same as those they had been familiar with in the general Church, thus perfecting the Church in the Confederacy. The name of "Reformed Catholic" was proposed for the new organization, but failed of adoption. Following the guidance of existing facts, as the Conference in Maryland had done eighty years before, they called it the "Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America." The Prayer-Book was changed by substituting Confederate States for United States throughout.[1] Arkansas, then a Missionary Jurisdiction of the old Church, was admitted as a diocese in the new one. Shortly afterward Alabama elected Dr. R. H. Wilmer to be its bishop. This compelled the new Church to discharge the functions of a General Council. The consent of the several standing committees was secured, and the senior bishop in the Confederacy took order for his consecration. In all respects the new organization proceeded to act as a national Church.

Confederate Church and Federal authorities.

But in the daily life of its members it encountered grave difficulties. Apart from the hardships and privations which arose from their territory being the seat of war, their liturgical worship brought them constantly into conflict with the Federal military authorities. Their Liturgy put into their mouths words of prayer for the Confederacy instead of for the United States and its President. Its

[1] Dr. Fulton calls attention to the curious fact that in the only edition of this Prayer-Book ever published (by Eyre and Spottiswoode, London), the words United States remained by an oversight in the Forms of Prayer to be Used at Sea. So that aboard the "Alabama" (if the company prayed at all) they must pray, "That we may be a safeguard to the United States of America, and a security for such as pass on the seas on their lawful occasions"!

use put them at a disadvantage as compared with the other Christian people in the Confederacy. The Romish Liturgy, being in a language not understanded of the people, and recognizing no ruler but the Pope, could be used in the United States or in the Confederacy or in the planet Jupiter with equal fitness. Non-Liturgical clergymen could avoid words of constructive treason by any periphrases they chose. If their petitions were only intelligible by God, they need not offend any earthly authority. But Churchmen were in an evil case. If they held public worship at all, they must offend. To use the prayers for the rulers or to omit them was equally dangerous. In 1862 General Butler issued an order that "the omission, in the service of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New Orleans, of the Prayers for the President of the United States, would be regarded as evidence of hostility to the Government of the United States." In a lengthy correspondence which ensued, the general undertook to show the clergy what the Canon Law required in the premises. His canonical knowledge was equal to his military skill. But the discussion was terminated by the forcible closure of the churches. The rectors were arrested and sent North as military prisoners, but upon their arrival at New York were at once set at liberty. Similar conflicts were constantly occurring as the Federal forces gained control of more and more territory. Dr. Wingfield of Portsmouth, Va., was condemned to the chain-gang for a similar offence. Dr. Smith of Alexandria was arrested in his chancel for refusing to use the Prayer for the President of the

General Butler as a Canonist.

United States at the command of a military officer who was present.[1] General Woods inhibited the Bishop and all the clergy of Alabama. For a time, the churches in that State were closed, and armed guards stationed at the doors to keep them from being opened.[2] The Bishop was followed to his retreat by an officer instructed to see that he should pray for the President of the United States. One of his clergy consented to use the prayer for the President, but "under protest!"[3] A letter from the Bishop to President Lincoln produced an immediate revocation of the obnoxious order. Such instances might be multiplied indefinitely. The Church in the South had set itself in antagonism to the United States by the very fact of its existence. Its *raison d'être* was the assumption that certain States had actually withdrawn from the Union. From the Northern point of view, they not only had not gone out, but by attempting to do so they had committed a flagrant offence. The Church became *particeps criminis* in the offence. Its Liturgy made it impossible for it to evade the consequences of its original act of organization. The only final justification of revolution is success. In this case success was wanting. In its absence, all concerned in the attempt bore their share of the awful cost of failure. None bore it with a better grace or a more patient dignity than the short-lived Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States.

Fall of the Confederate Church.

[1] Slaughter: Memorial of the Rev. George Archibald Smith, p. 41.

[2] Wilmer: The Recent Past, p. 146.

[3] The Bishop, very properly, wonders what would be the precise effect of such a prayer?

CHAPTER XII.

THE REUNITED CHURCH.

In the spring of 1865 the Confederacy ceased to be. With its dissolution the reason for the Southern Church passed away. Their contention from the first had been that, being cut off from the United States by no act of their own, the dioceses in the seceded States simply conformed to existing facts in organizing a new church. Now, on their own principles, their Church's place was gone. Their Prayer-Book was obsolete. There was no longer any "President of the Confederate States" to pray for if they had wished it. But it was not so clear that they had been borne back involuntarily into the Protestant Episcopal Church by the reflux of the tide. They might not be willing to resume their long vacant places; the Church might not be willing to receive them. They had gone out because a political chasm separated the two sections. That gulf was now closed, but not until it had been filled with human blood. Fortunately old friendships still held. The Presiding Bishop, Hopkins of Vermont, and Bishop Elliott of Georgia, the leader in the Southern Church, were more than brethren. Their old affection for each other was unbroken. Elliott clearly discerned the situation. "We appealed," he said, "to the God of battles, and He has given His

Moving toward reunion.

decision against us. We accept the result as the work, not of man, but of God."[1] In this temper he was ready to work for peace and unity. But all were not of his mind. Chagrin, humiliation, apprehension, and anger were common among his people. The unhappy "reconstruction" period had set in. Military governors were still in occupation of the late seceded States. Bishop Hopkins, with the knowledge and consent of his brethren, sent a circular letter to all the Southern Bishops, assuring them of a welcome if they would take their places in the approaching General Convention in October. Bishop Wilmer of Alabama expressed the sentiment both of his own State and Mississippi[2] when he replied that it was by no means clear as yet that the Southern dioceses might not retain their separate position; that would depend upon circumstances not yet determined;[3] that they could not come back as supplicants for pardon; that human passions were facts which must be taken account of; that the best men in the South were yet under the ban as traitors; that their representative man might yet be hanged; that all would depend upon the spirit shown by the General Convention itself when it should meet; that they could abide the result of the war, but could not yet join in *Te Deums* over their own defeat.

Obstacles in the way.

Apart from the sore temper on the one hand, and the triumphant one on the other, there were grave difficulties to be adjusted. The Bishop of Alabama had been

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 339.
[2] Wilmer: The Recent Past, p. 166.
[3] Ib., p. 155.

elected and consecrated outside of the Church's rules. Arkansas had been taken from the missionary jurisdiction of the Southwest, and erected into a diocese. Worst of all, Bishop Polk of Louisiana had broken Catholic rule and violated Christian sentiment by taking arms. But his name was dear in the South. A graduate of West Point, he had been almost forced into command at a time when competent leaders were hard to find. He had assumed the duty most reluctantly.[1] But he was urged on every hand. Even the old Bishop of Virginia had called to his mind, when he hesitated, that "the conduct of Phinehas was so praiseworthy that the inspired David says it was accounted to him for righteousness through all posterities for evermore; and did not Samuel, the minister of God from his infancy, lead forth the hosts of Israel to battle, and with his own hand slay the king of Amalek?"[2] He had taken up the sword against his will, and sought in vain to be allowed to lay it down.[3] At Pine Mountain he had fallen, and his blood had discolored the Prayer-Book in his pocket, and half washed out of it the names, written by his own hand, of his three friends, Johnson, Hood, and Hardee.[4] Any suggestion of censure upon the conduct of the dead could not be borne.

Bishop Polk.

All these things made the Southern people hesitate. They needed not to have done so. When the General Convention met at Philadelphia in October, 1865, the

[1] Fulton, in Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 581.
[2] Green: Life of Bishop Otey, p. 96.
[3] Ib., p. 100.
[4] Fulton, in Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 583.

clerk of the House of Deputies began with "Alabama" in calling the roll of dioceses. The roll had never been changed. Alabama and the other Confederate States had only been absent from one meeting, and their names had never been removed. To the general gratification of all, two Southern bishops, Atkinson of North Carolina, and Lay of Arkansas, were present at the opening service. They came, doubting both their right and their welcome.[1] They were hospitably entreated and constrained to take their places. The Convention acted on the dreaded questions with good-sense and generosity. It was resolved that the Bishop of Alabama should be received upon signing the ordinary declaration of conformity.[2] No question was raised about the regularity of his consecration. The case of Arkansas had settled itself. Its short life as a diocese had been destroyed by the ravages of war. The Church within it was practically extinct. Bishop Lay had been all the while, in spite of himself, the missionary bishop of the Southwest. In that capacity his place was still open. The career of Bishop Polk was not referred to. He was dead. But the harmony came near being destroyed by an unexpected means. The House of Bishops proposed a thanksgiving service for "the restoration of peace and the re-establishment of the National Government over the whole land." The Bishop of North Carolina protested that his people could not say that. They acquiesced in the result of the war, and

General Convention of 1865.

Reunion imperilled.

[1] Harrison: Life of Bishop Kerfoot, vol. ii. p. 391.
[2] General Convention Journal, 1865.

would accommodate themselves to it like good citizens; but they were not thankful. They had prayed that the issue might have been different. They were ready to "return thanks for peace to the country, and unity to the Church;" but that was a different matter. Bishop Stevens of Pennsylvania moved to substitute the Southern man's words for the ones in the resolution offered. His motion was carried by sixteen to seven.[1] When the amended resolution was offered in the House of Deputies, Horace Binney of Pennsylvania moved to restore the original phrase giving thanks "for the re-establishment of the National Government over the whole land," and to add to it "and for the removal of the great occasion of national dissension and estrangement to which our late troubles were due" (referring to slavery).[2] A storm of discussion at once arose, both within and without the Convention. The secular press of the country took up the matter; declared that the loyalty of the Church itself was upon trial; that it dare not refuse to pass Mr. Binney's patriotic resolution; that too much tenderness had already been shown to "unreconstructed rebels." Dr. Kerfoot, President of Trinity College, came to the rescue.[3] He had been, all through the war, a Union man in a place where his loyalty had cost him something. His college in Maryland had been well-nigh destroyed. He had tended the wounded at Antietam and South Mountain, battles fought at his very door. He had

Horace Binney's resolution.

[1] Perry: History, vol. ii. p. 592.
[2] General Convention Journal, 1865.
[3] Harrison: Life of Bishop Kerfoot, vol. ii. p. 393, *et seq.*

been seized a prisoner by General Early's order. His goods had been destroyed by the Confederate soldiery. He, if any one, had the right to speak. His own loyalty was beyond all question. He begged the Convention to remember that it had itself invited and urged the Southern delegates to come; that the place to celebrate the triumph of the Northern arms was outside of the Church; that not only the present but the future peace of the Church was at stake; that if the Church should be led by its passions now, future unity would be impossible; that "their thanksgiving for unity and peace should ascend to the throne of God in such a form that all could honestly join in it."

Dr. Kerfoot's plea.

His wise and earnest argument prevailed. By a vote of twenty dioceses to six, Mr. Binney's amendment was defeated,[1] and the House of Bishops' more generous terms were carried. This action settled the question of reunion. The Southern Church met once more at Augusta, closed out its affairs decently, and was no more.

Reunion.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in its integrity entered upon its modern life in an undivided nation. The generation now living had come upon the stage. But the war had done far more than to settle a political dispute. It had profoundly changed the conditions of American life. It introduced four millions of manumitted slaves to a new social, political, religious existence. The old methods of the Church for them were no longer applicable. The awful problem pressed to find

[1] General Convention Journal, 1865.
[1] Brand: Life of Bishop Whittingham, vol. ii. p. 74.

new and efficient ones. The war had done much to break up sectarian isolation. When young men who had been taught in their country homes that Romanism was pure abomination, had been gently nursed by Sisters of Charity in the military hospital, their prejudices were greatly shaken. When Churchmen had their wounds bound up and heard extemporaneous prayers offered at their side by Methodist and Presbyterian chaplains and Christian Commission agents, they changed their thought about the validity of a ministry which bore such fruits. When these in turn heard Churchmen openly recite the Creed and say their prayers, they were arrested and impressed. The end of the war was followed by a period of restless moving to and fro. Soldiers had learned to travel. They brought back with them to their quiet homes a broader habit of mind and a quickened consciousness of national life. They brought a wider thought to the congregations where they worshipped. A ferment was working in every province of life. It could be seen in commerce, art, and social habit. Religion felt it also.

Religious effects of the war.

The Church was in the presence of a new set of facts and forces. To understand them would require of her judgment and a sound mind, the spirit of wisdom and ghostly strength. The Doctrine of Evolution, just coming into notice, was to change her whole way of regarding life and man. The teaching of Robertson, Maurice, and the author of "Ecce Homo," with the new method in History and Criticism, was to become a solvent of many of her accepted dogmas. The revived movement of population

New forces and new problems.

westward was to tax her missionary spirit to its utmost. Her great work among the Indians in the Northwest, already begun, was to be carried to completion. She was to plant a church in Hayti, and to aid and foster one in Mexico. The wisdom and energy needed to adjust herself to the changed conditions of life was to be drawn off for a period into the long, dreary, barren contest over Ritual. The amazing spectacle of grave and learned theologians and jurists endeavoring to perform *modistes'* and dancing masters'[1] work was to be displayed before the astonished eyes of an earnest generation which had just fought a mighty war over questions of the first rank. Bishop Cummins and his following of restless spirits were to add a superfluous sect to the divisions of Christendom. The Church Congress was to give outlet to surcharged thought, and to bring men to a better knowledge of each other's spirit. The "Church Idea" was to be infused into American Protestantism. The task of the memorialists was to be taken up again, and the Liturgy revised to fit the exigencies of common life. The idea of a mechanical uniformity was to be unconsciously forsaken. The Episcopate was to break from its trammels, and proclaim to the divided Christian world the Church's hope and plan for Unity.

[1] A committee of five bishops, among the greatest in learning and character, deliberated and reported concerning the washing of the priest's hands, bowings, genuflections, reverences, bowing down upon or kissing the holy table; a surplice reaching to the ankles for choristers; a surplice not reaching below the ankle for priests; stoles, bands, black gowns, and university caps. General Convention Journal, 1871.

INDEX.

Abolitionists, the Church and, 363.

Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy, 8, 26; effects of, 11, 26, 32; in Maryland, 106; in Scotland, 155.

Adams, John, on the Establishment, 185; on the Episcopate, 251.

Advancement Society, 293.

Alabama, 328; secession of, 369, 371, 375, 377.

America, condition of, in 1600, 5 *et seq.*; in 1700, 86 *et seq.*, 95, 98; in 1800, 277; modern, 292.

American Church, 130; effects of revivalism upon, 144; need of an Episcopate, 173-189; three motives of reconstruction, 217; efforts toward organization, 220 *et seq.*, 238; structural development, 264.

Americanism, 121, 335.

Amusements, 159.

Anabaptists, 39, 72.

Andros, Gov., 44; in New York, 63; opposition to William and Mary College, 115.

Anglo-Catholics, 337, 339.

Anne, Queen, 31, 125, 148.

Antrim evictions, 156.

Architecture, 199, 329.

Arkansas, 359, 369, 371, 376.

Articles, the Thirty-nine, 274, 331.

Asbury, Mr., 290, 313.

Assembly, Colonial, acts of, 21, 23, 84; established the Church in New York, 64; hostile legislation of, 110, 122; proposition to, 117.

Atkinson, Bishop, 370, 377.

"Awakening, the Great," 136 *et seq.*, 170; and the Evangelical movement, 318.

Bacon, Ephraim, 321.

Baltimore, Lord, 48, 49, 51.

Baptists, relations with the Indians, 20; among the Puritans, 35, 41; in New York, 63; doctrine of the "Inner Light," 72; numbers in Maryland in 1703, 105; in North Carolina, 124; on the Memorial of 1853, 354; attitude toward slave question, 360.

Bass, Dr., 259.

Bedell, Dr., 318.

Benade, Bishop, 341.

Berkeley, Dean, 133.

Binney, Horace, 378.

Bishop, *see* Episcopate; Methodist, 171.

Bishop of London, 23, 47, 66, 92, 96, 117, 194; Compton, 97, 175, 177; powers of, 109, 115, 121, 175, 192; Gibson, 110; Lowth, 170, 229; Tenison, 177, 179.

Blair, Commissary, 89; in Virginia, 112; efforts for William and Mary College, 113; *see* Commissaries.

Blaxton, William, 39.

Böhler, Peter, 152; influence on Wesley, 164.

Boston, parish organized, 43; *see* Massachusetts.
Boucher, Dr., 111.
Bowman, Dr., 353.
Boyd, 318.
Bray, Commissary, 89, 90, 96, 111; visit to America, 97; his memorial, 98; in Maryland, 105; *see* Commissaries.
Breck, 323.
Bristed, 318.
Bristol College, 327.
Brown Brothers, the, 38.
Bull, 318.
Burgess, Bishop, 350, 352.
Burlington, N. J., 179, 191; convention in, 1705, 178.
Butler, Gen., as a canonist, 372.

California, 357, 358.
Calvert, Lord Baltimore, 48, 49, 51.
Calvinism, in Scotland, 153; and the Evangelicals, 316; in the Church, 330.
Carolinas, the, 82; the Church there, 84, 124, 125, 293; condition in 1820, 296; Bishop Ravenscroft, 320; secession, 329.
Catholic, 332, 338; renaissance, 324; nature of the Church, 342, 350.
Centralization, 324 *et seq.*, 329; 338, 366.
Chandler, Dr., 184, 186, 227.
Charles I., 31; loyalty to, in Virginia, 112; in Scotland, 233.
Charleston, 83, 84.
Charter withdrawn from Massachusetts, 42; from Maryland, 55.
Chase, Bishop, 293, 301, 305, 318.
Christ Church, Philadelphia, 81; Savannah, 162.
Church, the, effect of Act of Uniformity upon, 11, 12, 26, 32; in Raleigh's colony, 14, 112; in Gorges' colony, 15, 94; first in America, 17; relations with Indians, 20; lack of sympathy from colonists, 20; legislation in regard to, 21, 94, 106, 110; relaxation of laws and manners, 24, 136; condition in 1700, 25, 57, 86, 95, 98; relation to State, *see* Church and State; temper of, 32, 172; in New England, 35 *et seq.*, 94, 127, 185; in Maryland, 54, 58, 105; in New York, 63, 93, 284; attitude of Quakers toward, 74, 78; in Pennsylvania, 80, 102; in the Carolinas, 83, 124; conflict with vestries, 92, 93; S. P. G., 96, 98, 103; buildings, 102; work of Keith and Talbot, 101, 103; the Commissaries, 105, 112; attempt to reform manners, 107, 117; apathy to educational interests, 113, 114; devoted men in, 120, 342; in Connecticut, 132, 289; attitude toward revivalism, 140, 142, 145; theory of religion, 138, 144; secret of growth, 146, 172; influence of the Scotch, 157, 159; mistaken policy, 12, 158, 170; relation to Methodism, 160 *et seq.*, 169, 172, 290; theories of, *see* Theories; condition before the Revolution, 190; growth of, 191, 193, 342, 354; services, 200; Tories in, 204; attitude toward the Revolution, 205 *et seq.*; after the Revolution, 217, 219; three motives in reorganization of, 217; property, 219, 221, 222; organizing and naming, 220, 223; the federal idea in, *see* Federal; fundamental principles (1784), 239; Constitution of, 240 *et seq.*; structural development of, 264, 310; State autonomy, 273, 297, 300, 309; French influence, 280; condition in the South, 286; in 1820, 295, 297, 311; among the

pioneers, 298; national quality of, *see* National; propagandism, 309, 310, 326; "High" and "Low," 315, 316, 320; movement West, 322, 357; two ideals of, 323; centralization, 324, 356; the Church idea, 326, 328, 329, 343, 381; as a sect, 342, 343, 348; Unity, *see* Unity; attitude toward slavery, 361; in the Confederacy, 369; reunited, 374, 379; new problems, 379, 380.
Church and State; churchman's theory of, 27; Puritan theory of, 26, 27, 31; Romanist theory of, 26, 27; Pilgrims' theory of, 28; English theory of, 30, 93; alliance between, 31, 42, 93, 110, 126, 160, 180, 209; conflict between, 109, 117, 121, 123, 185, 189; at the Revolution, 205 *et seq.*; after the Revolution, 215; at the Civil War, 365, 366, 368.
Civil War, effects of, 379, 380.
Claggett, Dr., 281, 286.
Clayton, Rev. Thomas, 81.
Clergy, character of, 18, 21, 56, 57, 111, 113, 115, 120, 342; dress of, 87, 199, 285, 328; social status of, 88, 91; manners of, 89, 90, 107; lack of equipment, 96, 113; conflict with the people, 109, 121; discipline of, 115, 117, 119; support of, *see* Support; numbers of, 195; not called priests, 201; position at the Revolution, 205; sufferings of, 209; in 1800, 311.
Clerk, the, 87, 200.
Cobbs, Bishop, 370.
Coke, Dr., 290.
Colonial legislation, *see* Assembly and Legislation.
Colonies, Raleigh's, 14; Gorges', 15, 36, 94; Virginia, 16, 112; Massachusetts, 29; Maryland, 49; New York, 59; Swedes on the Delaware, 69; Friends in New Jersey, 75; Penn's, 79; South Carolina, 83; Georgia, 124, 162; legal status of, 184.
Commissaries, in Maryland, 105; in Virginia, 112; *see* Bray and Blair; in Northern colonies, 126.
Commonwealth and the Church, 24, 176; in Virginia, 112.
Confederate Church, 369 *et seq.*
Confirmation, 200, 282.
Congregationalists, on the Memorial (1853), 354.
Connecticut, the Church in, 36, 132, 191; first convention, 225; ecclesiasticism, 238, 240, 254; in 1812, 289.
Constitution, of Church, 242, 258; discussion of, 261; change in the spirit of, 309, 310, 324.
Convention, in 1783, 221; Constitutional (1785), 240; in 1786, 252; in 1789, 259; in 1792, 299; powers of, 265, 268, 272, 309, 367; in 1812, 288; in 1844, 339; in 1853, 358; in 1862, 367; Confederate, 369, 370; 1865, 377; *see* General Convention.
Conversion, J. Edwards's theory of, 138, 313; Wesley's, 165, 313; the principle, 169, 172, 313.
Convocation, 107, 265.
Corporation for the relief of widows and children of Clergy, 201, 238.
Coxe, Dr., 326, 353.
Craik, Dr., 353.
Creed, the Athanasian, 246, 249, 263; Nicene, 246, 253, 256; Apostles', 247, 253.
Croswell, Dr., 326.
Cummins, Bishop, 381.
Cutler, President of Yale, 127.

Dare, Virginia, 14.
Dashiell, Daniel, 286.
Davis, Bishop, 370.
Deism, 166, 195, 248.
De Lancey, 343.
Delaware, 69; in 1820, 296.
Diaconate, the, revival of, 349, 351, 352, 356.
Diocesan autonomy, 274, 351; subdivision, 324.
Discipline, 109; decline of, 117; difficulties of, 176; Bishop's powers of, 266, 267; of laity, 270; trial of Bishops, 325.
Dissenters, 106, 125, 133; inclination toward the Church, 102, 178.
Doane, Bishop, 326, 350, 351.
Doddridge, Rev. Joseph, 298, 299.
Dogma, 153; changes in prayer-book, 248; anti-dogmatic spirit, 248, 332; new methods and, 380.
Duché, Dr., 286.
Dutch, the, 59 *et seq.*; ecclesiastical position, 61; dealings with Puritans, 61; toleration, 62; attitude toward the Church, 63, 102, 193.

Ecclesiasticism in New England, 238, 254, 255; and the federal idea, 240; increasing, 325; and the Oxford movement, 340.
Education, 96, 97, 198, 294; opposition to, in Virginia, 114; Dean Berkeley and, 133; academies and seminaries, 293; Bishop Otey in Mississippi, 309; Bishop Chase in Ohio, 305.
Edwards, Jonathan, 136; theory of conversion, 138; influence of, on American Church, 138, 329; relation to Wesley, 170.
Elizabeth, Queen, 48.
Elliott, Bishop, 365, 366, 369, 374.
Emigration to America, occasions of, 8, 23; conditions for, 18; from Germany, 147; Scotch-Irish, 156; to West and South, 301, 357.
Endicott, John, 37.
England, condition of, in 1600, 9; at the Reformation, 153; in 1750, 165; feeling toward American Church, 229; in 1825, 330.
English, theory of the church, 30; ignorance of American affairs, 180; Church ceased to exist in America, 209, 217.
Episcopacy, 128, 336; and Presbyterianism, 154; and Methodism, 170.
Episcopate, the, 173, 250, 348; plans for American, 65, 110, 176, 178, 179; need of, 108, 116, 176, 194; reasons of failure, 180; current conception of, 181; opposition to, 182, 229; impossible till after the Revolution, 187; "Independent," 187; Dr. Seabury and the Connecticut plan, 227; resort to Scotland, 231; in the Middle States, 250; the two lines of, 254; English succession, 260, 281.
Establishment, the, in Massachusetts and New York by English law, 42, 93, 94, 185; in Maryland, 55; unpopular, 57, 186, 217; by the Assembly, 64, 103; in South Carolina, 84, 125.
"Evangelical Episcopal Church," 287.
Evangelicals, the, 145, 311; compared with Methodists, 312; differentiate of, 313; theory of Church, 315; function of, 312, 316; cause of decline of, 316; in 1853, 317; leaders of, 318; Knowledge Society, 320, 338.
Evans, Evan, 95.
Evans, H. D., 338.
Evolution, doctrine of, 380.

Fackler, St. M., 358.
Federal Idea, the, 236, 264, 273, 297, 300, 306, 356, 366; and the ecclesiastical idea, 240, 281; revolutionary character of, 265; new departure, 309, 310, 324.
Fletcher, Gov., 64.
Flushing Institute, 327.
Fourth of July Office, 247, 263.
Fox, George, 71, 75.
Franklin, Benjamin, 131, 189, 205; influence of, 196.
Freeman, Bishop, 353.
Freeman, of King's Chapel, 248.
French influence, 280, 288.

General Convention, powers of, 270, 271, 272, 309, 367; in 1844, 339; memorial to (1853), 344 *et seq.*; spirit of, 356; and the Confederates, 375.
Georgia, 124; Wesley in, 162; secession, 369.
Germans, 147; religious and social condition, 149; relations with the Church, 151.
Gibson, Bishop, of London, 110.
Gorges' Colony, 15, 36, 94.
"Great Awakening," the, 136, 159, 329.
Greek Church in Alaska, 358.
Green, Bishop, 369.
Gregg, Bishop, 370.
Griffith, Dr., 253, 258, 281.
Griswold, Bishop, 293, 318, 326.

Hawks, 326.
Hayti, 381.
Henry, Patrick, 120, 123, 287.
Hervey, 313.
Higginson, Rev. Francis, 29.
High Churchmen, 316, 319, 321.
Hobart, Bishop, 284, 286, 293, 294, 318; churchmanship of, 319, 328, 335.
"Holy Club," the, 161, 164, 312.
Hook, Dean, 334, 336.
Hopkins, Bishop, 318, 326, 368, 374, 375.
House of Bishops, *see* Episcopate.
Huguenots, in New York, 62, 63; in Maryland, 105; in South Carolina, 125.
Hunt, Rev. Robert, 16, 18, 113.
Hymns, 200, 272.

Immigration, of Germans, 147; checked, 151; of Scotch-Irish, 156.
Independents, in England, 26; ready to conform, 178.
"Independent Episcopal Church," 187, 224.
Indians, the, character of, 6; attempts to convert, 7, 19, 113, 192, 293; first convert, 14; relations with churchmen, 20; with Penn, 77; with the Welsh, 82.
Individualism, 329.
Infidelity, 280, 288, 334.
Ingham, 313.
Inglis, Bishop, 208, 227.
"Inner Light," doctrine of, 72, 76, 79.
Ives, Bishop, 340.

James I., 30, 48, 154.
Jarratt, Devereux, 288.
Jarvis, Dr., 256.
Jefferson, 280, 281.
Jesuits, missionaries, 5, 6; in Maryland, 50, 52.
Jews, the, in New York, 62.
Jones, Morgan, 82.
Jubilee College, 305.

Keble, 326, 331.
Keith, George, Quaker, 79; missionary of S. P. G., 101, 103, 177.
Kemp, Bishop, 286.
Kemper, Bishop, 343, 351.

Kentucky, 298, 301, 306; church organized, 307.
Kenyon College, 305.
Kerfoot, Dr., 378, 379.
King's Chapel, 46; Unitarianism of, 248.
Kip, Bishop, 338, 358.

Lake, Arthur, Rt. Rev., 29.
Laws, *see* Legislation.
Lay, Bishop, 377.
Laymen in Church councils, 242, 243, 255, 258, 261, 265, 266.
Leaming, Jer., 227.
Lee, 120, 287.
Legal status of the colonies, 184; of the Church, 123, 185.
Legislation, concerning religion, in Virginia, 21; Puritan, 22, 34; spirit of, 22; English laws and colonial, 94; in Maryland, 106; hostile to the Church, 110, 122.
Liberalism, 332.
Lincoln, President, 363, 369, 373.
Liquor, production of, 279; question, 326, 363.
Liturgy, control of, 271; compulsory use of, 348, 351, 352, 354; revision, 244, 261, 357, 381; Confederate, 371.
Lockwood, Henry, 321.
Louisiana (New Orleans), 293, 302; secession, 369.
Low Churchmen, 284, 315, 320, 322.
Lutherans, in New York, 62; Swedish, 69, 352; attitude toward the Church, 102, 152, 178, 194; in Maryland, 105; in Pennsylvania, 150.

Madison, Bishop, 281, 290.
Madison, President, 205.
Manteo, 14.
Marriages, performed only by clergy, 92, 107.
Marshall, Samuel, 84.
Martyn, Henry, 321.
Maryland, colonized, 49; Protestant revolution, 53; Yeo's account of, 54; charter revoked, 55; in 1700, 57, 105; the Establishment, 106; reorganizing the Church, 220, 221; in 1820, 296.
Massachusetts, 36, 41, 42, 94, 185.
McIlvaine, Bishop, 318, 338, 368.
Meade, Bishop, 288, 293, 326, 328; Evangelical, 318; on the Memorial of 1853, 352; on slavery, 364; secession, 365, 369, 370.
Meeting-houses, joint use of, 44.
Memorial, Dr. Bray's, 98; of 1853, 344; report of committee upon, 354; fatal choice, 355; task taken up, 381.
Mennonites, 72, 76, 150.
Methodists, 160; lost to the church, 12, 171, 291; in Georgia, 124; relation to the Church, 160, 169, 170; origin, 161; purpose, 168; come to America, 170; bishops, 171; after the Revolution, 288; Dr. Coke's plan of union, 290; among the pioneers, 298, 307; Evangelicals and, 312, 318; ecclesiastical empire, 329; on the Memorial of 1853, 354; on slavery, 360.
Miller, Chaplain, 65, 177.
Minnesota, 323, 359.
Missions, to Indians, 1, 7, 19; of the S. P. G., 99; new departure, 300, 309; foreign, 321; general, 327.
Mississippi, 308, 328; secession, 369, 375.
Missouri, 327.
Moore, Bishop, 284, 318, 328.
Moravians, 20, 152, 164; and the Church, 341, 353.
Morton, John, 36.
Muhlenbergs, the, 151, 206, 326, 327, 343, 355, 357.

Name of the Church, 220.
National Church, 11, 297, 299, 300, 309, 310, 318, 324.
New England, first colony in, 29; Puritans, 26 *et seq.*; planting the Church in, 35; "converts," 127, 256; condition just before the Revolution, 190; reorganization, 223; plan for the Episcopate, 223; ecclesiasticism of, 238, 240; after the Revolution, 289; in 1820, 295.
New Jersey, 75; (Burlington), 178, 179, 191; in 1820, 296.
Newman, 331; his purpose, 332; the outcome, 334, 337, 340.
Newton, John, 313.
New York, settled, 59; coming of English Church to, 63; Trinity Parish, 67, 95; in 1700, 95; just before the Revolution, 191; party strife, 284; in 1820, 295.
Nicholson, Gov., 89, 115, 116, 179.
Nitschman, Bishop, 152.
Nonjurors, 232, 256.
North Carolina, *see* Carolinas.

Ogle thorpe's settlement, 124, 161.
Ohio, condition in 1820, 296, 298, 301; Phil. Chase, 302, 306, 323; Church organized, 303.
Old South Meeting-House, 44.
Old Swedes Churches, 70.
Onderdonk, Bishop, 326, 327.
Orders, the question of, 128, 130, 174, 345, 349, 351; Scotch, 233; relation of the three, 266.
Ordination, difficulties of, 176; power of selection for, 268.
Oregon, 358.
Organization of the Church, two theories of, 173; in Maryland, 220; in Virginia, 222; in New England, 223; political obstacles, 226; in the Middle States, 238; fundamental principles, 239.
Otey, Bishop, 307, 320, 343, 350, 365, 370.
Oxford Movement, the, 329, 333 *et seq.*; results, 334, 340, 341.

Paca, Gov., 221.
Paine, Tom, 195, 280.
Parker, Dr., 256, 258, 259, 293.
"Parsons' Cause," the, 121.
Penn, William, 76, 77.
Pennsylvania, colonized, 77; first Church, 80; Christ Church, 81; in 1700, 95; Talbot's report, 102; University of, 131, 195; German immigration, 148; "Dutch," 149; in 1820, 296.
Philadelphia, 69, 70, 79, 80, 81, 156; *see* Pennsylvania.
Pilgrims, the, 28.
Pocahontas, 19.
Polk, Bishop, 343, 376; on the Memorial of 1853, 352; on slavery, 366, 369, 370.
Porteus, Bishop, 317.
Potter, Bishop Alonzo, 343, 350, 351, 357.
Prayer-Book, imposed by law, 10; distasteful to Puritans, 37, 38, 94; scarcity of, 87; English book in use, 244; revision of, 244, 261, 262, 270, 311.
Presbyterians, lost to the Church, 12; with the Indians, 20; Dutch, 61, 62; in New York, 65; in the Carolinas, 84, 124; in Maryland, 110, 111; and revivalism, 140; in Scotland, 153; in America, 156; attitude toward the Church, 157; influence, 159; after the Revolution, 281; among the pioneers, 299; strife, 329; on the Memorial, 353; on slavery, 360.
Promotion of Christian Knowledge, Society for, 97.
Propagation of the Gospel, Society for, 96; *see* Society.

Property, the Church's, 219, 221, 287, 295.
"Proposed Book," the, 245; *see* Prayer-Book.
"Protestant Catholics," 57.
Protestant Episcopal Church, 220, 341, 342, 350.
Protestantism, 174, 332.
Provoost, Bishop, 207, 249, 253, 258, 284, 285.
Puritans, 26, 136; lost to the Church, 12; attitude toward the Church, 16, 29, 36, 39, 94, 128, 132, 183; laws, 22, 34; theory, 31; temper, 32; and the Prayer-Book, 37, 38; joint use of meeting-houses, 44; quarrel with, ended, 47; and the Dutch, 61, 62; influence upon the ministerial office, 91; relaxation of religious life, 136; and revivalism, 142, 143.

Quakers, lost to the Church, 12; attitude toward the Church, 23, 78, 102, 103, 193; with the Puritans, 35, 41; with the Dutch, 62; George Fox and the "Inner Light," 72; in New Jersey, 75; William Penn, 76; George Keith, 79; in Maryland, 105, 106.

Randolph, John, 120.
Ravenscroft, Bishop, 307, 320, 341.
Redemptioners, 149, 197.
Reformed Church, the, 150, 329; on the Memorial of 1853, 354.
Reformed Episcopal Church, 355, 381.
Revision of the Prayer-Book, *see* Prayer-Book.
Revolutionary War, 202.
Richmond, William, 358.
Ritualism, 161, 271, 272, 355, 381, in Georgia, 163; and the Memorial, 355.
Robinson, Rev. John, 28.
Romanists, the, 48 *et seq.*; and Puritans, 26; attitude toward Acts of Uniformity and Supremacy, 27; Lord Baltimore, 48; religious liberty among, 50; proscribed in Maryland, 55; decadence, 53, 105, 339; attitude toward the Church, 110; and Anglo-Catholicism, 329; growth, 339; converts and perverts, 340; on slavery, 360.
Rutledge, Bishop, 370.

Sacraments, position of, 144, 341.
Salem (Mass.), 29, 33; (N.J.), 75.
Salmon, 328.
Saltonstall, Gov., 131.
Schwenkfelders, 151.
Scott, Thomas, 313, 317.
Scott, Th. F., 358.
Seabury, Samuel, 200, 207, 208, 218, 237, 249, 257, 290; elected bishop, 227; career, 227; consecration, 229, 234, 255, 260; Toryism, 262; manner, 289; churchmanship, 319.
Sect, the Church as a, 342, 343, 353, 355; first American, 160.
Service, 11, 87, 199, 200; for Fourth of July, 247, 263.
Sewell, 81.
"Siebentagen," the, 151.
Simeon, 313, 314, 321.
Sisterhoods, 354.
Skelton, Francis, 29.
Slaves, first, 21; influence of, 192; question of, 279; division of Churches upon, 360; the Church's attitude toward, 361 *et seq.*
Smith, Bishop of South Carolina, 282.
Smith, Bishop of Kentucky, 307.
Smith, Capt. John, 9, 16, 20.
Smith, Dr., 216, 237; reorganizing and naming the Church, 220;

elected bishop, 221; character, 253, 258, 311; revising the Prayer-Book, 345.
Social conditions in America, 198, 199, 311; 1790 to 1812, 277; French influence, 280; modern, 292.
Society for Propagating the Gospel (S. P. G.), 96, 99, 178, 192; archives of, 104; in South Carolina, 125; in New England, 224.
South Carolina, *see* Carolinas.
State Autonomy, 273, 297, 300, 306, 309, 310, 324, 338, 366.
State, *see* Church and State.
State Idea, *see* Federal Idea.
Stevens, Bishop, 378.
St. Philip's, Charleston, 84.
Stuyvesant, Peter, 62, 70.
Sunday, observance of, 159.
Sunday-schools, 294, 320, 351.
Support of the Church, 21, 57, 121, 201; in Massachusetts, 43; in New York, 67; in South Carolina, 85; in Maryland and Virginia, 92, 107, 117, 121; by S. P. G., 101, 103; in Vermont, 190; lotteries, 201; church property after the Revolution, 219, 221, 287.
Supremacy, Act of, 8, 26.
Surplice, 87, 199, 328.
Swedes, 69, 70; reformed church, 341, 351.

Talbot, John, 101, 103; report from Philadelphia, 102, 177.
Temperance question, 326.
Tenison, Bishop of London, 177, 179, 180.
Tennessee, 301; Church organized, 308; (Memphis), 328.
Texas, 328, 359; secession, 369.
Theories, of the Church, Puritans', 27, 31; Churchmen's, 27, 343; Pilgrims', 28; English, 30, 93; two now extant, 173; in New England, 223; of religion, 138, 144, 164, 165, 168.
Thirty-nine Articles, the, 274, 331.
Toleration, Act of 1688, 32; Romanist, 50, 51, 52; in Maryland, 58; among the Dutch, 62.
Tories, 204, 207, 216, 225, 247, 279.
Tractarians, the, 330; object, 333; results, 334, 338, 340, 341.
Trinity, the doctrine of, 248, 249.
Trinity Church, New York, 67, 95.
"Tunkers," the, 150.
Tyng, 318.

Uniformity, Act of, 8, 10; effect of, 11, 12, 26, 32; in Maryland, 106; tendency toward, 271; uncatholic, 348, 352; "catholic," 352; forsaken, 381.
Unitarianism, 248.
Unity, striving for, 257; Dr. Parker's scheme, 259; secured (in the Church), 263; with Methodists, 290, 291, 292; Memorial of 1853, 346, 350, 353, 357; the Church's hope, 381.
Universalism, 317.
University, of Pennsylvania, 131, 135; of the South, 369.
Upfold, Bishop, 353.
Uses, variety of, 11.

"Venerable Society," 96; *see* S. P. G.
Venn, 313.
Ver Mehr, Dr., 358.
Via Media, 335, 340.
Virginia, 14; Commissary Blair in, 112; loyalty of, 112; reorganizing the Church, 222; condition in 1800, 287; in 1820, 296; seminary, 321.

Wainwright, Bishop, 338, 350.
War, the Civil, effects of, 379, 380.
Warrington, Rev. Thomas, 123.
Washburn, Dr., 355.
Washington, George, 120, 203, 287.
Welsh, the, and Indians, 82; Church colony, 120.
Wesley, 124, 161, 329; in Georgia, 162; among the Moravians, 152, 164; his conversion, 165; purpose, 168; organization, 169, 171, 291.
West, the Church in, 322, 357, 358, 381.
White, Bishop, plan for American Episcopate, 188; confirmation, 200, 282; patriot, 207; after the Revolution, 218, 224; career, 237, 290; revising the Prayer-Book, 245; elected bishop, 253; striving for unity, 258; and the English succession, 260, 262; death, 320.
White, Rev. John, 29.
Whitefield, George, 124, 168, 329; character, 141.
Whittaker, Alexander, 19, 113.
Whittingham, Bishop, 326, 343, 365.
Wilberforce, Bishop, 362, 363*n*.
William of Orange, 46, 64, 232.
William and Mary College, 113; value to the Church, 116; after the Revolution, 288.
Williams, Bishop, 350, 352.
Williams, Roger, 40, 62.
Wilmer, Bishop, 371, 375
Wilmington (Del.), 69.

Yale College 127, 134.
Yeo's report of Maryland, 54.

SERMON STUFF.

By the Rev. S. D. McCONNELL, D.D.

THIRD EDITION.

12mo. Cloth. $1.00 net.

"It certainly is the most remarkable collection of sketches we have ever seen." — *The Standard of the Cross.*

"We can readily see how they can be made an immense help to an overtaxed and hurried preacher, in the way at least of suggestion, and to all such we heartily commend it." — *The Christian at Work.*

"We find among them many ingenious, forcible, and suggestive *schemata* for the pulpit." — *The Independent.*

"For clear, manly, strong thought, we frankly commend this book as a model to sermonizers." — *The Christian Union.*

"We cannot think of any other single volume of equal merit in its particular line." — *The Living Church.*

"The usefulness of this book will lie in its stimulating effect; the danger, in the temptation to borrow slavishly from it. The two completed sermons at the close show how well the author clothes his own skeletons with flesh." — *The Literary World.*

"It is the only work of the kind I ever saw that was worth the paper that it was printed on." — A correspondent in *Standard of the Cross.*

*** Copies mailed postpaid upon receipt of price.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 and 3 Bible House . . . . . NEW YORK.

SONS OF GOD.

Sermons

By S. D. McCONNELL, D.D., Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia.

One Volume, 12mo, Cloth, Price $1.50.

THE F. W. ROBERTSON OF AMERICA.

"To open a volume of sermons by an unknown author is a lottery in which we oftener than otherwise draw a blank. The pleasure is enhanced by its very uncommonness when, on the other hand, we encounter on every page the thoughts of a live thinker and a live man. This has been our good fortune in looking through the volume entitled, 'Sons of God,' by Dr. McConnell, of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Philadelphia. Under Dr. McConnell's guidance we traverse the region of religious thought to find at every step noble prospects opening, and to become constantly aware of subtle harmonies obtaining between the truth he is handling and all other truth in the universe. Of all American preachers he most reminds us of our own Robertson of Brighton. There is the same sure insight piercing into the core of the matter, and presenting its conclusions in terse sentences which quiver with meaning. His sermon on 'Christ's Working Theory of Life' is incomparable as a vindication of the Christian ethic as against the sneer of its being sentimental and impracticable. We imagine this is Dr. McConnell's first introduction to the public on this side the Atlantic, but he ought to secure a wide and deeply appreciative circle of readers."

—*The Christian World*, London.

"These discourses might well serve as a model for the young minister."—*Christian Literature.*

"A dish of strong, juicy meat for men, well cooked and well served; but the weak and the theologically dyspeptic had better beware of it."—*Boston Literary World.*

"These sermons cannot fail to help those who desire to love God with all their heart and all their soul *and all their mind.*"

—*Standard of the Cross.*

"We admire his vigor, and his noble conception of human life and destiny,"—*The Churchman.*

"This is a clever volume of sermons, vigorous and abounding in illustrations."—*The Rock.*

"These sermons are striking, powerful, eloquent."

(London) *Church Review.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER, Publisher.

2 and 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

The Chief Things;

OR,

CHURCH DOCTRINE FOR THE PEOPLE.

By REV. A. W. SNYDER.

12mo, Cloth binding, $1.00. *Paper covers*, 50 *Cents.*

"It is just what we want."—*Bishop Whitehead* (*Pittsburgh*).

"It is an indispensable aid in parish work."—*Rev. C. W. Leffingwell, D.D.*

"The author has gathered into a volume twenty-six essays on just those topics and questions pertaining to Church faith and worship on which a multitude of people, both without and within our congregations need to be instructed. The statements are always clear, concise, direct and persuasive. There is nothing extravagant, overwrought, fantastic or bitter. Many of the essays would make excellent chapters for lay-reading."—*Rt. Rev. F. D. Huntington, D.D.*

"It will do good. It has the rare merit of lucidity."—*The Rev. S. D. McConnell, D.D.*

"I think it will have a large sale. I hope it will."—*Bishop Brewer* (*Montana*).

"I am glad to see Mr. Snyder's tracts in book form, and predict for them a wide circulation and increased usefulness as so published."—*Bishop Neeley* (*Maine*).

BISHOP THOMPSON'S NEW BOOK.

THE WORLD AND THE MAN.

Being the Baldwin Lectures for 1890, delivered at Ann Arbor, Mich., by the Right Rev. HUGH MILLER THOMPSON, D.D., LL.D. 12mo, cloth, $1.25. *Just Out.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

THE WORLD AND THE LOGOS.

The Bedell Lectures for 1885. Square 12mo, cloth, $1.00.

"As a superb piece of dialectic, as a capital example of good fighting, this little book will be a real enjoyment."—*The Churchman.*

"They deal with the Darwinian theory of evolution, and the unbeliever in that doctrine will read the volume with a glow of satisfaction and a feeling that the common-sense side of the question—from his point of view—was never before so clearly and convincingly put."—*Boston Transcript.*

THE WORLD AND THE KINGDOM.

The Paddock Lectures for 1888. 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

"'The World and the Kingdom' is a remarkable little volume of addresses by the Bishop of Mississippi. Dr. Thompson's vigorous and eloquent book will, it is to be hoped, attract many readers outside the limited circle of divinity students. Briefly put, these discourses are based on 'development, the law of the Spiritual Kingdom,' and the uniformity that governs both natural and spiritual processes. The thesis is not new, of course, for much has been written upon it, especially by writers 'concerned about the reconciling of religion and science.' But Dr. Thompson's interpretation of man's position in the world leads to conclusions altogether different from those arrived at in the popular literature to which he refers. Man is not engaged in a mere brutal struggle for existence but in a struggle for mastery. In the physical world the environment is accepted, by man it is disdained. He is not content to adapt himself to the environment, but in conquering it by continuous development towards more complex environments forever spurred onward and forever discontent with victory. While apparently 'a product of the world like all the rest,' his life is yet a perpetual conflict with the forces that produced him. Science and knowledge do nothing to allay the Faust fever of his spirit, his irrepressible aspirations, his 'blank misgivings,' nor do they explain his post-cognitions of what Marvell calls 'the happy-garden state, and that imperial palace whence he came.' These, says Dr. Thompson, are primal questions of humanity and not to be charmed into silence by any knowledge of matter and its phenomena. You may apply the principle of heredity here and find the key to the perplexity. These intimations of another state are reminiscences inherited. Almost all peoples have some such faith or tradition, however shadowy, and what is common to all must have a common origin.

"We have but touched upon one or two salient points of the Bishop's argument. The full force and significance of his stimulating book will, we are confident, interest all sorts and conditions of readers."—*Saturday Review.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

THE BEAUTIFUL LAND:

PALESTINE,

HISTORICAL, GEOGRAPHICAL AND PICTORIAL:

DESCRIBED AND ILLUSTRATED AS IT WAS AND AS IT NOW IS, ALONG THE LINES OF

OUR SAVIOUR'S JOURNEYS.

BY

JOHN FULTON, D.D., LL.D.

Introduction by the Rt. Rev. HENRY C. POTTER, D.D.

ILLUSTRATED BY FIFTEEN MAPS AND CHARTS, OVER THREE HUNDRED ENGRAVINGS, AND A GRAND PANORAMA OF JERUSALEM.

"This handsome volume is especially designed for the large number of Bible students who never expect to visit the Holy Land. Dr. Fulton is a learned clergyman of the Episcopal Church, who ranks high as a clear, forcible and thoughtful writer, and his record of a leisurely journey made through Palestine is well worth reading. Many books have been written about the Holy Land, but hardly any of them are available for the uses of the ordinary student. . . . To take such a journey with a well-instructed and sympathetic cicerone, is a great privilege. In traveling it is not enough to see; one needs also to know what to see and how to see it. Dr. Fulton does not simply reproduce the atmosphere of the distant past so that it lives again before us, though he does that; but he relates to us in a pleasant fashion the later history of the localities whose story he tells, so that the chasm between the days of old and the present day is bridged over for the reader."—*From the New York Tribune.*

"The title of this book is a full description of its character and contents. It is indeed a most valuable volume for the Christian student or traveler to the Holy Land. The idea of traveling along the lines of our Lord's journeys is certainly original, and the exceeding care and pains which Dr. Fulton has taken to be accurate in his statements and thorough in every part of the work increase its value."—*From the New York Observer.*

"What a book, we think, for every Bible-teacher to be possessed of! Certainly, at least, no Sunday-school should be without one or more library copies for the teacher's reference, to the enlightenment of his task of making all things clear to the musing and questioning minds of the young. It is a compendium of all that is certainly known of that Beautiful Land, related in a style of rare attractiveness, and it will be found a fitting gift for pupils who have excelled in their Bible lessons and studies."
—*From the Living Church.*

STYLES.

1. **Handsomely bound in best silk cloth, with rich and artistic stampings in ink and gold on front cover and back. Price, $3.75.**

2. **The same style, with full gilt edges. Price, $4.50.**

3. **In half morocco binding, library style, strong and elegant. Price, $6.00.**

☞ *An Agent wanted in every parish. For terms apply to*

THOMAS WHITTAKER, 2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

THE CYCLOPÆDIA OF NATURE TEACHINGS.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY REV.

HUGH MACMILLAN, LL.D., F.R.S.E.,

AUTHOR OF "BIBLE TEACHINGS IN NATURE," ETC.

8vo, Cloth Extra. Price, $2.50. **Just Out.**

One of the most characteristic features of modern culture is the attention given to the facts, moods and suggestions of "Nature."

Teachers and preachers are feeling the need for illustrations from Nature in their pulpit, platform and class work, and as the scientific knowledge and the love of Nature increase in schools and in congregations, there must be an increasing demand for illustrations taken from the spheres in which audiences are becoming daily more interested.

The **Cyclopædia of Nature Teachings** is a collection of remarkable passages from the writings and utterances of the leading authors, preachers and orators, which embody suggestive or curious information concerning Nature. Each passage contains some important or noteworthy fact or statement which may serve to illustrate religious truth or moral principles, the extracts being gleaned from the widest and most varied sources.

The passages are arranged alphabetically under subjects, and subdivided so as to elucidate the topic treated of and illustrate it in every possible way. Thus under the head of THE AIR, we find on this subject passages are given on THE BEAUTY OF CLOUDS, THE MYSTERIES OF THE CLOUDS, CHANGES IN THE SKY, MISTS AND SUNSHINE, THE MESSAGE OF THE HEAVENS, SKY INFLUENCES, AUTUMN, SUNSHINE, PLANTS, THE ATMOSPHERE, etc., etc.

That the **Cyclopædia** is a work of true value and reliable information will be seen by the names of the following authors, from whose writings, among many others, some of the extracts are taken, viz., RUSKIN, JEFFERIES, MACLAREN, MCCOOK, HUGH MACMILLAN, BEECHER, SMILEY, WILSON, PULSFORD, GUTHRIE, FROUDE, LYTTON, ROBERTSON, ARTHUR, ARNOT, HERSCHEL, PROCTER, FABER, TAYLOR, DAWSON, HELPS, EMERSON, DICKENS, AGASSIZ, PARKER, CONDER, CHALMERS, BALDWIN, BROWN, CUVIER, RICHTER, GŒTHE, etc.

The volume forms a most valuable work of reference, and by its orderly arrangement puts its wealth of information and suggestion at the disposition of the student or teacher; but the varied character of the selections, the freshness of the subjects treated, and the literary grace of many of the paragraphs will also make the work welcome to general readers.

The **Cyclopædia of Nature Teachings** is furnished with a very copious index of subjects, and also one of Bible texts.

NEW YORK: THOMAS WHITTAKER, 2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE.

PROF. T. K. CHEYNE'S WORKS.

The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter, in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions. With an Introduction and Appendixes. Eight Lectures Preached before the University of Oxford in the Year 1889. 8vo, cloth, $4.00.

"The Oriel Professor at Oxford (Dr. Cheyne) is an earnest, conscientious and industrious critic. His Bampton Lectures are the outcome of twenty years' study and research. He asks to be considered not a 'fledgeling,' but a critic of fully adequate experience, not a 'Germanizer,' but an honest English worker in Biblical exegesis. He settles on the principles of the 'higher criticism' numerous disputed questions in regard to the Book of Psalms."—*N. Y. Times.*

The Book of Psalms; or, the Praises of Israel. A new Translation, with Commentary. 8vo, cloth, $3.00.

"We not only welcome this volume by the Canon of Rochester as a delight to scholars, but also commend it to all devout laymen and students who, believing the Bible to be the Word of God, may yet have to complain of having it expounded, and the Gospel preached, in seventeenth century phrase, and with the traditionalist's fear of the dreadful nineteenth century knowledge that is so rapidly cracking the rind of authorized opinions."
—*The Critic.*

The Prophecies of Isaiah. A new Translation, with Commentary and Appendixes. Revised. Two volumes in one. 8vo, cloth, $4.00.

"Mr. Cheyne's work is in many respects one of the most noteworthy of our day. . . He has been a devout and careful student of Isaiah for some twenty years past."
—*N. Y. Times.*

"We rejoice that a Commentary which must be marked 'indispensable,' is thus put within the reach of a larger number of those who love the great prophet."
—*Andover Review.*

"The qualities of Mr. Cheyne's Commentary would make it a good book in any language, or almost in any condition of Biblical learning. It is perspicuous without being superficial, and terse without the omission of anything of importance."—*Academy.*

Job and Solomon; or, the Wisdom of the Old Testament. 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

"This is certainly one of the most fascinating and delightfully readable works in Biblical criticism that has come under our eye for a long time. If Robertson Smith or Welhausen had a style like that of Cheyne the rapidly advancing science (or art) of Biblical criticism would soon be amazingly popular."—*The Critic.*

The Hallowing of Criticism. Nine Sermons on Elijah, Preached in Rochester Cathedral. 12mo, cloth, red edge, $2.00.

THOMAS WHITTAKER, Publisher,

2 and 3 Bible House, New York.

THE RIGHT ROAD.

A Hand-Book for Parents and Teachers.

BY THE

REV. JOHN W. KRAMER.

12mo, cloth binding, - - Price, $1.25.

"There is not a dull page in it. Even the bad boy who dislikes moral lectures will like pleasant chats: he will take the moral pills for the sake of their sugar coating, if for nothing else. Parents will find this excellent book helpful in getting their children on the right road and keeping them there."—*The Home Journal.*

"'The Right Road' presents John W. Kramer's plan of giving instruction to children, and of arousing their personal interest in the principles and practice of Christian morality. By means of simply worded observations, and a great variety of short stories, he undertakes to teach a child something about personal responsibility, right and duty. Under duty, instruction and illustrations are given concerning duties to one's self—such as cleanliness, temperance, truthfulness, courage, self-control, order, thrift, culture and purity, duties to others—honor of parents, patriotism, honesty, justice, mercy, philanthropy, courtesy, gratitude and kindness to animals, duties to God—embracing reverence, worship and service."—*The Interior.*

"As a treatise on practical ethics the book has decided merits. It treats of nearly all aspects of morality, setting forth the nature and the obligation of the various kinds of duty in a clear and simple style and in a manner likely to interest the young. The different virtues and vices are illustrated by numerous examples in the story form, some of them historical, other fictitious, and many of them are fitted not only to illustrate the habits of good conduct, but to inspire the reader with a love for them. The book is more manly than such books usually are, the strong and positive virtues being given the importance that justly belongs to them. The last section of the book and duty to God is excellent, and is by no means uncalled for in times like these."—*Critic.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER, 2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

AUBREY L. MOORE'S WRITINGS.

"With preachers like Phillips Brooks and M. Bersier the late Rev. Aubrey L. Moore was not unworthy to take rank, though his strength lay, perhaps, in delicacy of spiritual perception rather than in the more ordinary and popular forms of pulpit eloquence."—*The London Times.*

I.

Sermons Preached in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. By the late Rev. AUBREY L. MOORE. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Just Out.

II.

The Message of the Gospel. By the late Rev. AUBREY L. MOORE. 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

This volume contains three addresses on the Message of the Gospel; two on Vocation; and six sermons before the University of Oxford on the following topics: "The Veil of Moses," "The God of Philosophy and the God of Religion," "The Claim to Authority," "The Power of Christ on Moral Life," "The Presence of God in the Christian and the Church," "Decision for God."

"In bulk this is a small book, but like a jewel casket, small itself, its contents are of great price."—*The Churchman.*

III.

Some Aspects of Sin: Three Courses of Lent Sermons. By the late Rev. AUBREY L. MOORE. 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

IV.

Science and the Faith. Essays of Apologetic Subjects. With an Introduction. Second Edition. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

THOMAS WHITTAKER, Publisher,

2 and 3 Bible House, New York.

CANON FARRAR'S SERMONS.

I.

EVERY-DAY CHRISTIAN LIFE;

Or, Sermons by the Way.

By FREDERICK W. FARRAR, D.D. 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

"These sermons by Canon Farrar are the ordinary discourses of a parish priest to a customary congregation. They are upon subjects of every-day life. There is no wide-ranging speculation among them; nothing to gratify the seeker after suggested heresies, or at least the novelties of modern rationalism. But they are very delightful sermons to read—full of tender thought and happy suggestion, and written in a style which when the English clergy do attain it is one of the happiest known to the pulpit. As the other extreme of English preaching, the dead-and-alive manner of mere perfunctory talk is hateful to the last degree, so is this, its opposite, peculiarly pleasant."—*The Churchman.*

II.

TRUTHS TO LIVE BY:

A Companion to "Every-Day Christian Life."

By the same author. 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

"This is a volume of practical sermons written in a style free from mere technical language. The discourses are just what Dr. Farrar claims them to be—simple pastoral sermons. They deal mainly with doctrinal and fundamental subjects as they represent an attempt "to make clear some of the most essential truth of Christian faith."—*The Observer.*

CONTEMPORARY PULPIT LIBRARY.

New Sermons by the leading Anglican Preachers. Square 12mo, cloth, gilt top, $1.00 each.

No. 1. FIFTEEN SERMONS. By CANON LIDDON.
No. 2. SIXTEEN SERMONS. By BISHOP MAGEE.
No. 3. TWENTY SERMONS. By ARCHDEACON FARRAR.
No. 4. FOURTEEN SERMONS. By CANON LIDDON.
No. 5. FIFTEEN SERMONS. By BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

THOMAS WHITTAKER,
2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

CANON ROW'S NEW BOOK.

CHRISTIAN THEISM.

A Brief and Popular Survey of the Evidences upon which it rests, and the Objections urged against it considered and refuted. By C. A. Row, M.A. Small 8vo, cloth, $1.75.

"Prebendary Row has attained high repute by his previous publications, but we doubt if he has written anything more likely to be useful than the present volume, in which he sets forth in a popular form and with clearness and force of style the chief reasons on which Christian theistic belief is founded. It is avowedly a popular argument, adapted to the needs of the multitude of people who justly complain that many excellent treatises dealing with the subject are 'over their heads.' It also claims to be a comprehensive survey of the whole question as it is now debated, and grapples with current difficulties and objections which, if they do not subvert the faith of many, do nevertheless prevail with some, and cause widespread disquiet and perplexity."

— *The Standard of the Cross.*

"Among all the works of Prebendary Row in the general line of Apologetics of Christian belief, and they are many, this will be the most prominent in the list, the most thoroughly and lastingly useful."

— *The Living Church.*

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

REASONS FOR BELIEVING IN CHRISTIANITY. Addressed to busy people. 12mo, cloth, gilt top, 75 cents.

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE VIEWED IN RELATION TO MODERN THOUGHT. Bampton Lectures for 1877. Fourth Edition. 8vo, cloth, $3.75.

A MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES. 16mo, cloth, 75 cents.

FUTURE RETRIBUTION, VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF REASON AND REVELATION. 8vo, cloth, $2.50.

THOMAS WHITTAKER,

2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK.

CHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By THOMAS A. TIDBALL, D.D., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Camden, N. J. With an Introduction by S. D. McCONNELL, D.D. 12mo, cloth, $1.25.

"We notice on nearly every page the extensive reading of its author and the judicial mind, which not only attempts but proves the authenticity of the New Testament Books and their drift and purpose. The first lecture is to us the most striking; but all show learning and the Christian spirit. We know of no work which in like compass introduces so well the various books of the New Testament."—*The Southern Churchman.*

"The volume is scholarly, reverent, gracefully written, spiritual in tone; a really good book that makes one better as it clears his mind and lifts his heart."—*Every Thursday.*

"Dr. Tidball's style is felicitous for the lecture room, exact in expression, careful in the right presentation and due rounding of his facts, and agreeably free from any pedantries of learning."—*Living Church.*

"It can stand on its own merits as a popular presentation of a subject of perennial freshness."—*The Critic.*

"While there is little that is directly polemic in these pages, this purpose is largely attained, and that in the best possible manner. To each of the writers of the New Testament the question is virtually addressed, 'What think ye of Christ?' and the answer is of great apologetic value. Through all the obvious differences of style and treatment can be seen the one Lord and Saviour, and these apparent variations serve only to give a clearer outline of the life and work of the Great Exemplar."—*Churchman.*

"The introductory chapter to this volume, consisting of thirty pages, is in substance very similar to the 'Introduction to the New Testament' as commonly found in good commentaries. It treats of the origin and formation of the several books of their authors, of their general scope, and of recent criticism. It also gives an excellent definition of inspiration—the manner and measure of it. Then follow nine other chapters in which the author gives a study of the whole New Testament, in groups of books—the Synoptic Gospels, St. John's Gospel, The Acts, the Pauline Epistles, etc., the main object being to bring out their testimony to Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the World."—*Pacific Churchman.*

THOMAS WHITTAKER,
PUBLISHER,
2 & 3 BIBLE HOUSE HOUSE, - NEW YORK.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

283.73
M129
4th ed.
McConnell, Samuel David.

AUTHOR

History of the American Episcopal church...

TITLE

47485

283.73
M129 McConnell, Samuel David.
4th ed. History of the American Episcopal church...

47485